

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SEPTEMBER 3, 1938

WHO'S WHO

JUAN CABRERA DE MOYA is intimately acquainted with French Northern Africa. Years of service as a lieutenant in the French Foreign Legion, the French Camel Corps, Captain and Battalion Commander, he has the added distinction of intimate friend and pupil in African lore of Father Charles Foucauld. He was born in San Francisco, Calif., educated at Eton, England, and received his Ph.D. from Salamanca, Spain, where he specialized in politics, ethnology, anthropology and history. His Spanish ancestry traces back to the noble Dons of Ferdinand and Isabella days. . . . WILLIAM J. DACEY, a newcomer to the pages of AMERICA, disagrees with the money theory advanced by Lawrence Lucey in the issue of July 30. Graduated from Boston College in 1928, he revels in his pet hobby, statistics, which he assembles for the statistical and buying department of a nationally known investment banking house. . . . PAUL L. BLAKELY discusses certain angles of the labor disputes centering around "Little Steel," with some timely observations on the Wagner Act. . . . M. J. HILLENBRAND, summering in a Colorado steel mill, states in a covering letter that "the passive acceptance by the public of the assertion that neutrality legislation has failed in principle, is the most dangerous factor in the formulation of future American foreign policy." His article strives to combat this attitude. . . . JOHN LAFARGE, writing from Paris where he is rounding up his work of investigation on the European situation, takes time off to act as our guide at the impressive ceremonies on the occasion of the rededication of the magnificent Cathedral at Rheims.

THIS WEEK

COMMENT 506

GENERAL ARTICLES

- French Leftists Provoke Crisis in Northern Africa J. Cabrera de Moya 508
Even Badgered Billions Have Rights, Also Obligations.....William J. Dacey 510
When the Devil Is Sick, the Devil a Monk Would Be.....Paul L. Blakely 512
Religion and Public Policy.....John Wiltbye 513
Our Neutrality Policy Needs Repairing, Not Junking.....M. J. Hillenbrand 514

EDITORIALS 516

- Communists at Washington . . . The N.L.R.B. . . . And Free Speech . . . Into the Furnace of Fire . . . Soviet Primaries . . . Civil Service . . . The Thankful Samaritan.

CHRONICLE 519

CORRESPONDENCE 521

LITERATURE AND ARTS

- The Angel of Rheims Wins Back His Smile
John LaFarge 523

BOOKS..... REVIEWED BY 525

- Communism and Man.....William J. Benn
Images in a Mirror.....Joseph R. N. Maxwell
A New Birth of Freedom...Daniel M. O'Connell
Saint Catherine of Siena.....Alfred Barrett

THEATRE..... Elizabeth Jordan 527

FILMS..... Thomas J. Fitzmorris 528

EVENTS..... The Parader 528

Editor-in-Chief: FRANCIS X. TALBOT.

Associate Editors: PAUL L. BLAKELY, JOHN LAFARGE, GERARD DONNELLY,
JOHN A. TOOMEY, LEONARD FEENEY, WILLIAM J. BENN, ALBERT I. WHELAN.

Editorial Office: 329 W. 108TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Business Manager: STEPHEN J. MEANY.

Business Office: 53 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK CITY.

AMERICA. Published weekly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., September 3, 1938, Vol. LIX, No. 22, Whole No. 1508. Telephone BARclay 7-8993. Cable Address: Cathreview. United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly \$4.00; Canada, \$4.50; Europe, \$5.00. Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, under Act of March 3, 1879. AMERICA, A Catholic Review of the Week, Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

COMMENT

RED RECRUITING for the war in Spain was the subject of investigation some days ago before the Dies Committee inquiring into un-American activities. The Committee voted to place its evidence before the Attorney General. Certain specified Communist organizations were charged with having engaged in recruiting Americans, contrary to law, for service on foreign territory. With each witness the story was materially the same. Recruits were smuggled out of the country under false pretenses, sometimes even with fictitious or falsified passports. Once in France, little difficulty was encountered in further smuggling them across the French border into Spain. There, passports were seized, Spanish names oftentimes entered on enlistment forms; at times recourse was had to the fictional process of naturalizing such recruits as Spanish nationals. And for the recruit there remained hardship, disillusionment, frequently death. The information disclosed by the Committee is nothing new. The fact of such recruiting practice, despite our laws to the contrary, has been exposed time and again. There is no question of "eye-opening" disclosure in this recent exposition of the activity of Communist organizations. There is no question as to whether these organizations have operated in defiance of our neutrality law. Here it is a question of whether the consequences of such defiant attitude are going to be pinned on to the violators and summary action taken against them. The Department of State is certainly not unaware of what has been transpiring. The time for punitive measures has come, not against the hood-winked, gullible recruits, but against the subversive un-American elements that scheme against our Government.

EPITHETS, human nature being what it is, are better weapons than arguments to silence unfavorable critics. Argue with a Methodist about the merits of prohibition and he will argue back. But deride him by linking him with the sour-faced, snooping effigy in a frowsy high hat that sprang fortuitously from the drawing-board of some bibulous cartoonist and he will shrink into his shell, unless he be a reactionary Methodist of the Bishop Cannon stamp. It took a long time for Hollywood to listen to the arguments of the Legion of Decency. When the producers listened, it was to Hollywood's advantage; but until they did, intelligent Catholic leaders had to face a barrage of name-calling from screen critics who labeled them as blue-stockings with puritanical, prudish and prurient inhibitions. No he-man enjoys being called an old lady or a sissie. The Communists have lately taken for themselves all the good names: "democracy," "the people's front," "liberal," "American League Against War and Fascism." They have reserved for their

opponents all the opprobrious epithets, the subtlest and latest being the cry of "Red baiting." J. B. Matthews, one-time Communist testifying before the Dies Committee, says that "this cry of 'Red baiting' is the best trick ever invented, short of a firing-squad, for making short work of anybody who dares to object to Communist theories or practices. If he isn't effectively silenced he is at least thoroughly discredited with that vast flock of citizens who like to think of themselves as liberals." By that standard the damaging anti-Communist testimony of Professor Edward I. Fenlon marks him as a braver and a nobler American than the "liberal," Henry Noble MacCracken.

WHILE President Roosevelt's words at Kingston, "the people of the United States will not stand idly by if Canadian soil is threatened," naturally caught the headlines, too little attention was paid to his further statement that the same people must render the final verdict on all our foreign policies, "... considering the evidence ... and rendering its own verdict ... these conclusions of educated men and women will, in the long run, become the national verdict." The thought is very similar to the Ludlow resolution, referring any war, except that of invasion, to a national verdict at the polls. There will be no war hysteria in such voting. American men and women have been educated by the World War in the fatuity of foreign entanglements and wars. Yet, typical of the mysterious 1938 propaganda in this country for such entanglements, a leading metropolitan editorial immediately interprets the Kingston speech as demanding a revision of the Neutrality Act. We are all but told the exact moment for writing our *J'accuse* in the international skies. More likely, however, attacks on our Neutrality Law will be directed to benefit Red Spain, especially as General Franco is insisting on his obvious "belligerent" rights. We repeat our plea of last week. Keep urging Mr. Hull to clamp down on the embargo.

NEITHER assurance of Mayflower descent nor old Dutch New York ancestry allays our concern with regard to the radical tendency, even domination, of the Second World Youth Congress. Notwithstanding protestations of democratic aspirations "pure, serene," still from the Trojan nag "the groans of Greeks inclosed come issuing thro' the wound." A goodly third, at least of the American delegation, were representative of radical organizations. Actions and pronouncements, that in many instances went unchallenged, spoke significantly of Dimitrov's vaunted policy. A representative of the Young Communist International pleaded oilily and suavely for

church cooperation with the Communist, then threatened that refusal of the Communist hand would foster war, and ended with denunciation of the Catholic Church in Spain. To neutralize charges of irreligion against the Congress, sessions began and ended with invocations; yet speakers protested against what was termed "excessive religious instruction by the missionaries," while others affirmed that "religious thought" had its limitations, and there was no discussion of the place of religion in the lives of youth. When it was announced that an answer must be found as between individual property rights or collectivism, vociferous responses of "collectivism" appeared to prevail. Throughout the Congress copious denunciation of Fascism was evidenced, but a marked absence of criticism of Communism and the Russian totalitarianism. The challenge voiced by several youth organizations, invited to attend, that the Congress let its stand be known on the question of Communism, as well as Nazism and Fascism, was sedulously avoided, though the booing of Italy and Germany and the denunciation of both ideologies sufficiently voiced its opinion of the latter. In a word, the Second World Youth Congress held at Vassar College has increased rather than allayed fears of radical domination.

- - -

IT is hard to know what is the best method for rousing Catholics to action. Knowing that our Kingdom is not of this world, we are inclined (it must be confessed this is one of the Catholic "vices") to be a little bit lackadaisical about this world. We are not so strained, so over-anxious, so ultra-eager to see a millenium happen right before our eyes as are, let us say, H. G. Wells, G. B. Shaw, S. Lewis. Still, we can be aroused, given the proper provocation. And what arouses us most summarily? Strangely enough, it is not the story of priests being murdered. We all figure that priests can, or ought to be able, "to take it." But once our enemies lay hands upon a nun, then we are immediately geared for action. The detail that aroused American Catholics concerning the War in Spain was not the fact that priests had been murdered, but that *nuns had been murdered*. This one item in the news report differentiated the ideologists among American Catholics from the flesh-and-blood Catholics. The ideologists (soon we shall have courage to mention their names) are all for such abstractions as "peace," "neutrality," "economic readjustment," etc. The flesh-and-blood Catholics are aroused at the thought that one of their Sisters has been raped or rifled by a firing squad. There are well on to one hundred and fifty thousand nuns in America. It might be not only chivalrous, but even sensible, to figure out now how they are to be protected.

- - -

GENERALISSIMO FRANCO'S reply to the British proposal for the withdrawal of foreign volunteers from the Spanish conflict is the only honorable answer that his Government could give. Representing as it does seventy-five per cent of Spanish territory and over sixty-five per cent of the population, the

Nationalist Government's rights as a belligerent have been deliberately overlooked. General Franco is emphatically not opposed to the withdrawal of foreign volunteers. In his reply he proposes the immediate retirement of 10,000 foreigners, not 3,000 as the British proposed. In fact, he has frequently asserted that he would gladly agree to the total withdrawal of all foreign participation. But he does reject the principle of proportionate withdrawal as unsound, unfair and impractical. His reply points plainly to evidence of fraud and deception in the execution of the plan as proposed by England. The duplicity of the Barcelona Government in entering fictitious Spanish names on enlistment forms for foreign volunteers, the fiction of a juridical process of even naturalizing such volunteers, the impossibility of tallying foreigners engaged in front line operations would frustrate any effective enforcement of the British plan. Observers and correspondents have attempted to attribute the tenor of Franco's reply to Italian influence. It is obvious to anyone familiar with the Spanish people that the presumption is false. Such observers seem to have overlooked completely what is of paramount importance, namely, the unflinching character of the Spanish people themselves. The whole reply breathes of Spanish individuality; it speaks of national pride and undying determination to maintain Spain's dominions inviolate from foreign domination. May that spirit prevail!

- - -

THE VISITS of Poland's Foreign Minister to some members of the bloc of neutral states that stand for neutrality and independence of action between Russia and Germany gave hope in the minds of many of the adoption of a "Buffer Bloc" whose center would be Warsaw. Later advices from Warsaw give little support to such hopes. The so-called "Third Europe" consists of smaller countries around the North, Baltic and Black Seas, with Switzerland, Holland and Belgium, desirous of remaining neutral in the game of politics and diplomacy between the Western democratic countries, the totalitarian axis and the Soviet. It constitutes no strict alliance, each nation holding to its own policies, refusing to be influenced by outside interests, with a common desire to avoid military involvements and becoming the battlefield between warring blocs. Poland seems satisfied for the nonce with such a role. It is to the interest of Poland that the balance between Germany and the Soviet remain as delicate as possible. Meanwhile, it is anxious for the excision of the sanctions' Article from the League of Nations Covenant. With an eye on complications that might easily arise in a Czechoslovakian crisis, where Poland might be obliged to allow the transit of Soviet munitions over her own territory, she is now more convinced on this than when she abandoned the Italian sanctions. A *Realpolitik* seems to be the most actual note in the present foreign policy of Poland. "Little Europe" may in this way exercise influence in deferring an extended war in Europe.

FRENCH LEFTISTS PROVOKE CRISIS IN NORTHERN AFRICA

Tenets of the Koran favor spread of Communism

J. CABRERA DE MOYA

IT is a well known fact that the war was won for France by the conservative elements of the people. All the best Generals, Foch, Petain, Maxime Wiegand, Castelnau, Mangin and many others were fervent Roman Catholics or, at the least, men with orderly minds and keen senses of duty. Most of the poilus—the fighting soldiers—were of sound, reliable, peasant stock.

But, shortly after the signing of the peace treaties, the Leftist politicians whose lack of wisdom had nearly ruined France in the first months of the war again came to the fore. They succeeded in gaining control by the very fact that those who had fought were too tired and too drugged by the delusion that all dangers and troubles had been eliminated, to realize that the mightiest nation can fall if a group of short-sighted opportunists insist on hammering at its foundations.

As far as Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco were concerned, the issue should have been clear. These Mediterranean provinces had been made prosperous by a wise administrative policy which had given a free hand to all the numerous French immigrants and to the naturalized immigrants of Spanish and Italian extraction.

These hard working and enterprising settlers had purchased and tilled their farms. They had organized agricultural cooperatives, and established manufacturing centers. Thus, they marshaled and directed the native Arabian, Berber, Jewish and negroid populace, and gave them employment.

When the World War began, industry, trade and agricultural activities were at top form in Algeria, Tunisia, and also in many parts of Morocco. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that French Northern Africa was able to aid so much the Metropole in the form of ample sums of money, raw and manufactured products, and hundreds of thousands of fighting men—commanded mostly by native officers and non-coms of European ancestry.

But, the post-War crop of French Leftist politicians and large numbers of the most hot-headed and least responsible citizens of France, were blind to the real status and needs of the colonies. For them, the recognition of the merits of the Arab and colored native was all that mattered.

Books were published, having as their slogan:

"The Raschid . . . the penurious Arab . . . first and last!" Committees were formed, advocating measures aimed toward bettering the "miserable" lot of the Moslem of Algeria and Tunisia. As was to be expected, there were also hordes of avaricious business men—anxious to seek a break-down of the established Algerian and Tunisian order of things, so as to salvage as much as possible of it for themselves.

A dozen years later, everything was in turmoil in French Northern Africa. Employees of European extraction had been forced to surrender their jobs to Arabs and Negroes, who, in some cases, far from being grateful, had conceived a supreme disdain for the weakness of Western rule and activities. Businesses and corporations had been disrupted, land owners were resorting to the policy of retiring to their own estates, where they lived on the products of the land, letting the future take care of itself.

Things reached a point when the sustained drive against Algerians and Tunisians of European extraction turned these formerly well-ordered and faithful citizens into enemies of the French Republican State, and made them prone to listen to the suggestions of foreign Fascist propagandists.

On the other hand, Communist and Socialist agents were making an appearance among the Berbers, Arabs and half-breeds. The work of these agents was all the easier because the Semitic mind is in itself antagonistic to discipline and authority. The Koran was no longer in the way, because Northern Africa ceased being zealous in matters of religion after the first decade of the present century. Besides the Koran, at a first glance, advocates also an equality and share-with-all policy that can be exploited advantageously by subversive propagandists.

Meanwhile, the world-depression was also hitting Algeria and Tunisia. With no market for export products, several of the industries of the two great North African provinces were forced to curtail their operations, or to put an end to them altogether.

In 1935, the economic condition of Algeria and Tunisia became desperate. Long columns of starving natives converged on the coast, clamoring for a relief that was not available. In these circum-

stances, the bread lines established by the White Friars and other Religious Orders proved inadequate, for, in spite of their good will, the clergy faced a recession of their own: the reduction of alms and gifts from Christians and Moslems alike, due to the all-around scarcity of money and available supplies.

A strong asset was still at the disposal of the French Colonial Administration though: the *Armée Coloniale*, and its Intelligence Service, which was the terror of all subversive elements and spies.

The *Armée Coloniale* had weathered a succession of crises: the unpopular conscription system; the suppression of the pre-World War gaudy uniforms, which, considered useless when all young natives were forced to serve under the Tricolor, regardless of whether they liked it or not, had been exchanged for drab khaki uniforms that were loathed by town Arabs and tribesmen; and, finally, the fact that the thirty-odd thousand men of the Foreign Legion had no more fighting to do. For active warfare was the safety valve of the hard-boiled, supertrained Legionnaires, mercenaries from all parts of the world, who were considered the king-pins of fighting efficiency of all the forces of Northern Africa. Underpaid, longing for the best days of their past and of their youth in their prolonged periods of inevitable leisure, the Legionnaires were bound to seek action, no matter how.

However, the beloved leader of the Foreign Legion was General Rollet, he of the red, silver-threaded beard, the d'Artagnan nose, and the smiling eyes of a fearless and good-natured veteran. As long as Rollet recommended obedience and order, the *Vieux de la Légion* would stand pat.

Rollet's popularity was so great among the troops of all races and color, and the prestige of his name was so high among the civilians of the towns and the tribesmen of the "bled," that many whispered, had he wished so, he could have placed himself at the head of a revolt and become Emperor of Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia. But the French Government knew that no mirage of power and glory could have induced General Rollet to forsake his duty.

Then the time came when the French Government decided to revive the old alliance with Russia. The excuses advanced to justify this momentous step were: the help that the Russian man-power and immense resources could have proffered in the event of a war with the Fascist powers; the advisability of counter-balancing the growing German and Italian influence in the Danubian basin and in the Balkans with the Russian one.

The leading minds of the Quay d'Orsay and many French statesmen were not so optimistic on the subject. However, it was undeniable that Poland had left the French camp for a policy of opportunism; and that, in Rumania and Jugoslavia, the Nazi infiltration was achieving its aims. On the other hand, Hungary, though distrustful of Germany, and subservient to Italy according to the old Oriental dictate that "the wise man must kiss the hand that he can't bite," still detested France

as much as ever she did on the eve of the Treaty of Trianon.

Only Czechoslovakia stood out as a strong and well-armed little nation, and as the staunch friend of France. But the Czechs were surrounded by enemies and had plenty of troubles with their minorities at home.

Thus, the French Government finally decided that Russia was too far distant geographically to harm France with its Communist virus, and proffered to the Soviets a hand of friendship which was easily grasped.

The announcement that France had become Russia's ally brought consternation among the ranks of the Foreign Legion, whose regiments were composed mostly of Germans and White Russians. The French Government became all the more alarmed by the discontent of its mercenaries because, at that time, the *Croix de Feu* and other ultra-nationalist and semi-Fascist organizations were forging ahead rapidly at home. Besides, the mistreated settlers of European extraction were becoming ultra-Fascists.

Under the circumstances, it was deemed necessary to eliminate the potential Rightist leaders from the ranks of the Legion. But Papa Rollet stood in the way.

Rollet had no use for politics. His hard-boiled Legionnaires took the place of the children that he had been denied; and it did not matter if some of his "children" were around fifty years of age, and looked like battle-scarred scarecrows. As was to be expected, when the expediency of eliminating several hundred men and officers was brought to his attention, Rollet declared curtly that, as Commander-in-Chief and Inspector General of the Legion, he intended to stand by every one of his men, regardless of their political opinions, as long as they did their duty as soldiers. Rollet was eventually maneuvered into a spot where his retirement became justifiable.

General Rollet had drifted into the shadows of the semi-forgotten personalities, when the advent of the Popular Bloc to the helm of France fostered a turn for the worse in the status of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. The Arabs and the Berbers took advantage of it to go one step further. Besides adopting the tenets of Socialism and Communism, they blended them into an independence movement of their own, based on the ancient Koranic principle of equality, and on the Semitic psychological aversion for all principles of authority.

The results of this whole mess are only too evident today in the hardly checked rebellious attitude that is neutralizing all constructive activities in French Northern Africa, and is repeatedly flaring up in dreadful excesses and sporadic uprisings.

History, however, proves that France is by far the most pliable and politically resourceful country in the world. Crises that elsewhere would result in irremediable ruin, in France have the uncanny knack of taking a turn for the better at the last minute, and prosperity is once again restored.

The new French Government, which succeeded

the Popular Bloc in the nick of time, considers the myth of Russian assistance in the event of a second world war without any undue enthusiasm. As a matter of fact, there are signs pointing to the fact that there is a surmise in French official circles that Fascism—particularly the Nazi version of it—and the Sovietism of Stalin are developing an increasing number of disturbingly similar features. This does not necessarily mean that the day may come when Russia will enter the field of the totalitarian Fascist countries, but, on the other hand, it does not entirely preclude such a possibility.

The new situation born from the German annexation of Austria, and the fact that Hungary—no matter where the shiftings of its policy may point—will most likely attack its age-old enemies, the Czechs, in the event of a world war, have turned French public opinion toward the advisability of keeping the Little Entente alive—either as a whole, or merely in part.

France will endeavor to stand by these aims without breaking the peace with Germany or Italy; otherwise France will set her ponderous armies

in motion once more. As far as Spain is concerned, France will strive to keep the Nationalists from overrunning Catalonia but, whether General Franco succeeds in pacifying the whole of Spain permanently or not, France will bitterly oppose the settlement of German and Italian troops on Spanish soil.

In regard to the Colonies, it is possible to foresee that the much delayed return to sanity of the Metropole will foster an attempt to recall the golden pre-War era. How such an apparently insurmountable task can be accomplished remains a matter for much speculation.

But, as we have said before, France is an extremely resourceful country and Frenchmen are exceptionally clever—once they succeed in looking clearly and impartially at the problem confronting them. At any rate, the Roman Catholic centers of Algeria, Tunisia, and the Sahara have more than weathered the storm raging all around them. In a crisis, they may constitute rallying points toward the re-establishment of the normal activities of peace and constructive order.

EVEN BADGERED BILLIONS HAVE RIGHTS, ALSO OBLIGATIONS

Logic and mathematics are merciless masters

WILLIAM J. DACEY



THE WRITER wishes to assure the editors and readers of this Review that he will employ neither violence nor rebuttals in his effort to appraise the suggestions for Financial Independence advanced by Mr. Lawrence Lucey in the final July issue of AMERICA. Academic heat must be cooled in the crystal springs of reason.

It is not an easy task to trace the trail blazed by Mr. Lucey through the reeling realms of government finance. Some might even question that a path had been broken, since the explorer arrived as he started—with the same \$40,000,000,000 government debt on his shoulders. But the evidence bears witness that he went somewhere, for the pieces of paper representing that debt miraculously have been changed. They are no longer insupportable burdens. They have acquired new significance; they are one way tickets to Bedlam.

In academic discussions, it is customary to clear

the atmosphere by a definition of terms. The word "debt" appeared frequently in the preceding thesis without comment, and will be used to a minor degree in this article. It may, therefore, be desirable to establish the limits within which this term shall be confined. The dictionary states that debt is "that which is due from one person to another; an obligation." This is a simple, understandable phrase. Let us adopt it.

When something is "due from one person to another," there is a clear implication that one party has a right to obtain that something. The second party necessarily must assume the obligation of observing that right. Any sound treatise on ethics will support this truism. Rights, to the best of our knowledge, cannot exist independently of duties in the finite order.

We are forced to admit at once that Mr. Lucey is at least logical in the sequence of the action he

offers for our consideration. "To put the financial system of Jefferson into operation now," he notes, "we must do the same thing as he proposed in 1791." Quite true. It could not be otherwise, for the Virginian bequeathed no blue-prints on New Deal finance. Rip van Winkles live only once, even in fiction. But he further demands that "we must have the Government buy back all its bonds, now rapidly approaching the \$40,000,000,000 mark. The Government must buy these bonds from the banks and insurance companies and other holders with new currency that it will issue and 'be bottomed by taxes.'"

We cannot quarrel with the theory that government has a constitutional right to levy taxes. Admitting that right, we must agree that there is a corresponding duty on the citizens of a state to pay the levies imposed. And if a tax is exacted to redeem currency which, when issued, is "bottomed by taxes," we are bound in conscience to remit our share of the impost. Therefore, an obligation is created. A debt is born. Our definition is clear on that point. How, then, do we secure relief from this new type of debt?

Perhaps arithmetic will provide an answer. Forty billions of dollars in new currency must be issued. Mr. Lucey has neglected to indicate the period of time in which this new money would be redeemed by the imposition of annual imposts. We might assume, however, that he is still faithful to his Jeffersonian precepts. The Virginian, we are told, would have issued notes "bottomed on a tax which would redeem them in ten years." Over a decade, consequently, we shall have to tax ourselves the average annual sum of \$4,000,000,000. These four billions multiplied by ten will equal the forty billions of currency which, in the supposition, was initially issued.

Let Mr. Lucey continue. "The Government would have \$1,000,000,000 per year more to spend on public works and relief, for it would not have to set this amount aside each year to pay the interest on its bonds. One-sixth of the tax money would no longer be turned over to the bondholders. Money depressions, caused by contraction of the amount of money in the nation, could never occur."

The logic of this particular passage is rather obscure. Its mathematics are slightly startling. An annual tax of \$4,000,000,000 is generally accepted as representing a heavier burden than an annual levy of \$1,000,000,000. And if \$1,000,000,000 is one-sixth of a certain sum, \$4,000,000,000 is definitely four-sixths of that same sum. It begins to look as though someone besides the bondholders would lose a portion of what they now possess. Someone will have to provide an additional tax which will make up the balance, namely, \$3,000,000,000.

An inquisitive mind probes deeper into the problem. What, for instance, would happen to our circulating medium of exchange when this annual tax of \$4,000,000,000 is extracted in cold cash from the pockets of labor, industry and finance each year for redemption of Mr. Lucey's currency? Would it not contract the circulating issue by a like total? Would it not contract it progressively, so that at the end

of a distracting decade \$40,000,000,000 would lie buried in the limbo of Government vaults? Or does Mr. Lucey infer that some happy method will be evolved whereby the levy would be re-infused into the arteries of business, so that the currency of the nation would be held at flood-tide levels? If this is his thought, the tax in that case is somewhat superfluous.

It might also be considered pertinent to locate the source whence the additional \$1,000,000,000 would be obtained "to spend on public works and relief." We have seen the burden of Government expenditure stagger to heights never before reached in so-called peaceful eras; the sachems of the Administration have been unable to match income with outgo; our present debt is the result. If, then, we are to take four-sixths of all currently available revenue to retire Mr. Lucey's greenback currency (for that is its true description) and if we are to disgorge current amounts on normal State functions for years to come, where are we to secure the additional \$1,000,000,000 for works of relief? Surely, Mr. Lucey does not wish to impose even greater tax demands. That is not a part of his preamble to a Declaration of Financial Independence. He would probably be the first to describe such a proposal as the prolog to general economic disaster and financial chaos!

Of course, we shall have to consider the disposition of the currency to be exchanged for outstanding bonds. Mr. Lucey proffers advice on this matter. He would have the banks, for example, invest their share of the proceeds in the productive field of business. Commercial activity, he feels, would be stimulated. This seems to be a constructive proposal. We all want to see industry expand, we all want to hear Messrs. Hopkins and Ickes announce the end of the crisis in unemployment. But Mr. Lucey is cautious. For he would prohibit these banks from "lending money which they do not own."

How much do they own, you ask? New York, the banking center of the nation, might provide an example. Statements of condition published by sixteen leading New York City banks on June 30, 1938, revealed that their total capital funds aggregated \$1,429,672,000. This figure represents the share of the assets of those banks actually *owned* by their stockholders. This, therefore, would be the absolute limit of their lending ability. And an inflated limit, at that, for they cannot lend their office buildings, they cannot lend their real estate. These assets are owned by the stockholders. They are part of the stockholders' equity. The deposits of \$11,171,429,000 must perforce remain idle, because the banks do not *own* these deposits. By what hocus-pocus of arithmetic can \$1,429,672,000 perform the service to the community that the quarantined deposits formerly achieved?

Mr. Lucey's plea for Financial Independence was ingenious. But it was likewise ingenuous. Logic and mathematics are merciless masters—and the flame of emotion is quickly quenched in their cool depths. Which is as it should be. Even badgered billions have their rights!

WHEN THE DEVIL IS SICK THE DEVIL A MONK WOULD BE

Both Labor and Capital show signs of illness

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

IN one of his sprightliest tales, P. G. Wodehouse introduces us to Mr. Mulliner at his ease in the bar parlor of the Anglers Rest. At the moment, Mr. Mulliner was discussing, with a Tankard of Ale and a Pint of Bitter, his nephew, Sacheverell. A youth of delicate perceptions, said Mr. Mulliner, he had at one time suffered from the well-known Schoolmaster Fixation or Phobia; and he was wont to assert that his late schoolmaster, the Rev. J. G. Smet-hurst, was a man who chewed broken bottles and devoured his young. The Tankard remarked that he had himself been similarly afflicted. He strongly suspected the head of his old school, he said, of conducting human sacrifices behind the fives courts at the time of the full moon.

Put these two pictures together, and you have the picture I once formed of Mr. "Tom" Girdler. Mr. Girdler, as chairman of the board of the Republic Steel Co., is noted—or was—for his aversion to unions, and equally, as his enemies in the C.I.O. aver, to the truth. But I have changed the picture. I changed it after listening to Mr. Girdler on the radio.

His address disappointed me. When you prepare to listen to a roaring lion, and the radio wafts you the soft complaining notes of a woodland dove at eve, you feel that you have been cheated. Surrounded by his loving brothers at a Lehigh University dinner, this rampant Tom Girdler became another Bottom, and spoke in a monstrous wee voice about his love for collective bargaining, and no guns or tear-gas in the offices of the Republic Steel Co., or spies in the mills, or a thumping big bill to be paid by his share-holders for strike-breakers and an army of assorted thugs. His speech was as tender as the *Moonlight Sonata* played by Paderewski; it asked, to borrow once more from Bottom, "some tears in the true performing of it."

Whether or not Mr. Girdler has fears for his health, I cannot say; but of late, he has certainly been talking about taking up a career that is suspiciously like that of a monk. Witness, too, his demeanor some weeks ago when he appeared before the LaFollette Committee. It all but disarmed Senator LaFollette who on this occasion, as the pie-bald *Nation* informs us, "pulled his punches." What, indeed, could the Senator do when Mr. Girdler, first

in his testimony and later in his written statement, asserted

There is no justification for espionage which is aimed at unionization of employes, or which would in any way interfere with their collective bargaining rights. Explicit orders against the practice in Republic are now in effect.

Further, Mr. Girdler admitted that as long as the Company hired agents for espionage and undercover work, it could not have a policy which welcomed collective bargaining. But the matter of spies had been "reviewed" by his board, "and I think it has stopped now." "Congratulations!" exclaimed Senator LaFollette, pulling his last punch.

But it is, only fair, imitating the Senate Committee, to allow Mr. Girdler to state the attitude of his corporation towards the C.I.O. and the Wagner Act. The Republic Steel Co., he asserts, is willing to bargain collectively with representatives of its employes, and, in fact, has been so bargaining for the last five years. Its refusal to sign a contract with the C.I.O. was based on three reasons. First, the employes did not wish this contract; second, the C.I.O. terms necessarily meant a closed shop and the check-off system; and third, the Company was convinced that the C.I.O. "was not under responsible leadership, and that Communistic influences were dominating its activities." A long series of strikes in plants in which C.I.O. agreements had been signed convinces Mr. Girdler that the Company was right in its belief that "there was no assurance that the agreement made by us would be kept by the other side."

That the Communists organize these strikes in C.I.O. plants is proved, Mr. Girdler thinks, by nearly every issue of the *Daily Worker*, and by a plain statement made in a report issued last March by the Central Committee of the Communist party. The Republic Steel will deal with any group chosen freely by its employes, but the C.I.O. arrogantly refuses to recognize any form of collective bargaining as valid, except that approved by its leaders. "Unfortunately for the country," added Mr. Girdler, "that is a philosophy that seems to be largely shared by the National Labor Relations Board."

Politics, labor politics included, make strange bed-fellows, and it is amusing to observe that in this indictment Mr. Girdler is in complete accord

with William Green, president of the A.F. of L., an association which was beaten as often as it tried to organize the steel industry. On August 20, Mr. Green was accorded an interview with President Roosevelt at Hyde Park, and he emerged full of joy and news. He had called upon the President to suggest changes in the Wagner Act as well as in the temperament and manners of the Board, and he told the press that the President was convinced that changes should be made.

This statement was undoubtedly authorized by the President. It is of real importance therefore, since up to the present the Administration has opposed amendment. Mr. Green has repeatedly charged that the Board favors the C.I.O. over the A.F. of L., "and I told the President of specific cases which I felt had been handled by the Board in a manner clearly in conflict with the letter and spirit of the law." In one of these cases, the Board ordered the Ambridge Products Co. to void its contract with A.F. of L. workers. When the employers appealed, the Federal District Court held the contract valid, but the Board set the Court at naught and ordered the company to hold an election. It desisted only when the election showed that the workers preferred the A. F. of L.

Mr. Green admitted that while he and the President had agreed that the Wagner Act needed amendment, they had not decided upon definite changes. No doubt the changes suggested by Mr. Girdler at the conclusion of his testimony have been studied by Mr. Green, and in my opinion, they are worth studying, whatever our appraisal of Mr. Girdler's past activities and present ambitions.

1. It is not necessary, said Mr. Girdler to the Committee, that the rights of employers be trampled upon in order to protect the rights of employes. But the Labor Board cannot possibly be impartial, when it acts as investigator, prosecutor, judge and jury. The Act should be amended to provide a thoroughly impartial tribunal.

2. The Act should be further amended to permit employer as well as employee to bring a complaint before the Board. "No law can be fair which grants one group a privilege which it denies to another group."

3. As administered by the Board, the Wagner Act deprives the employer of the right to express his opinions to his own employes in word or in writing. The Act should be amended to place the right of free speech beyond question.

4. The Act protects the employee against coercion by the employer. It should be amended to protect the employee against coercion from any source, specifically against coercion by labor-union organizers. This could be done by declaring that unions and organizers as well as employers can be guilty of unfair practices, and by providing appropriate penalties for offenders.

5. The Act should define the responsibility of labor unions. "If collective bargaining is actually to be what the term implies, each side to the bargain must be a responsible party."

It may be assumed that these changes will not be approved by John L. Lewis, nor will he approve

any changes suggested by Mr. Green. What his reaction to amendments made by President Roosevelt will be is a matter for conjecture. Mr. Green will probably feel that for reasons of policy he can take no hints from Mr. Girdler; besides, neither he nor Mr. Lewis will look with favor upon Federal legislation which imposes a measure of control upon labor unions. Sooner or later labor organizations will discover that to ask favors from the Government is to court Government control. The control should not follow, especially when organized labor asks protection for its rights, rather than favors, but that is the way of politicians, especially in this country.

According to a report published in the Hearst papers on August 23, Mr. Lewis will agree to an amendment which will end jurisdictional disputes between unions, and which will grant larger recognition to crafts unions in the A. F. of L. But he is said to oppose absolutely any plan to give the appellate courts the right to review questions of fact certified by the N.L.R.B., as well as questions of law.

But we can be thankful for at least one poor boon. Capital in the person of Mr. "Tom" Girdler has disavowed espionage and tear-gas. Assuming this conversion to be genuine, Capital may now aspire to higher standards in all its activities.

RELIGION AND PUBLIC POLICY

FOUR years ago, in an Eastern city which is largely, but not predominantly, Catholic, an official was dropped from the pay-roll. The cause for his discharge was unique: he had taken time out to be present at the Holy Sacrifice on Ash Wednesday! Of course, he was accused not on this ground, but on another wrapped with legal verbiage, of which the import was that he had not reported himself tardy.

For four years this man has been fighting in the courts for re-instatement. His immediate superior twice admitted in writing that an injustice had been done, and that he was willing to reinstate the tardy religionist. But the Mayor was determined that an example should be made, and that in the interests of order the injustice should be made permanent.

Happily the courts have at last intervened. Both the original charge and the Mayor's objections have been swept aside as trivial and contemptible. The man's record in office, the court observed, had been admirable. One offense, if offense it was, did not suffice for dismissal, and the attempt to elevate it into a crime was simply abuse of authority.

In these days of corruption, it would seem that the attendance of public officials at religious services ought to fit in well with sane public policy. But I cannot help asking myself what would have happened had a pious Jew been dismissed for attending the Synagogue on the Day of Atonement. Doubtless, it would have been made an international incident. In the case here set forth, no Catholic, as far as I know, made any objection.

JOHN WILTBYE

OUR NEUTRALITY POLICY NEEDS REPAIRING, NOT JUNKING

Liberals, Communists advocate policy leading to war

M. J. HILLENBRAND

WITH Washington officials addressing vague but significant weekly sermonettes to a sinful world, with the collective insecurity school riding a high horse, and with even Senator Nye advocating a stab in neutrality's back, the once-dominant idea of keeping this country out of the next war fades farther and farther behind a muddled foreground of distorted idealism and sheer hypocrisy. The Neutrality Act, which one year ago represented the acme of realism, a national blessing, now becomes a stigma of legislative stupidity, an unbearable repression of a free foreign policy.

Apart from the relative merit of the warring factions, the recent diluted liberal drive to hoist the Spanish arms embargo nearly completed the amputation of its conceptual legs: the principle of *no exceptions*. It was precisely the thought of one last great exception that made an essentially pacifist Wilson hold war our duty. Spain is a special case, excitedly argues the *New Republic* school of professors and preachers, but back in 1917 our drum-beaters said the same thing. One special case sets the precedent for another special case; eventually special cases become the only cases—and neutrality might as well be junked.

For what ideological group will we delegate to set up the criterion of judgment as to when a case is special? Certainly not our New York liberals, who consistently let their emotions ride rough-shod over common sense in a crisis, and usually end up by shouting identically bloody murder with a Communist party that has frankly abandoned all pretense about keeping American noses out of Europe's hell-broth.

With more consistency and growing volume the completely anti-neutrality-law chorus takes on a triumphant note: "Neutrality has failed; it was absurd in the first place—and see what a mess it has brought us into!" Murmurs of total repeal swell to confident prediction for the next Congress, yet the crucial fact remains that neutrality legislation has not failed, simply because it has never existed. Those who pushed Congressional action in the first place never got what they wanted, only a feeble hybrid full of loopholes and contradictions. All the theoretical arguments they advanced, still hold; for the so-called experimentally proved defects of the

1937 Act are completely extraneous to the original proposal of the mandatory school. Now in the lull before a possible storm is the time to hammer home these truths to a confused public; for once Americans begin to believe neutrality mistaken in principle and abstention from war impossible, they will soon find themselves sadly correct.

But criticism of the present statute reveals more than the weakness of the thing criticized; often the insincerity of the critics. If you set up objectives which neutrality advocates never claimed that the best possible measure would accomplish, and then announce the failure of neutrality legislation because it cannot accomplish them, you are simply talking through your hat. If you hypothesize future events with free fancy, you can create problems no country can, or ever will have to, solve.

With patronizing scorn, the knowing ones tell us that no mere words on the statute book can guarantee our immunity from war, that the factors which dragged us in before are too multifarious, complex and dynamic to legislate them into inertia. For how can anyone control the emotions, the sympathies of men, which inevitably force them to take sides? How control the occurrence of all incidents which can provoke them to the boiling point? Suppose, for example, that a ruthless German air raid on Paris or London, with their 7,000 and 5,000 permanent American residents, should blow up and mangle our citizens along with the rest. Or suppose other similar horrors and misdeeds.

Now, only the Marxists and some simple-minded liberals, who were all aghast at the revelations of the Nye munitions investigation, ever believed that nations went to war solely for economic reasons. What the sponsors of a mandatory neutrality act do say is that nations go to war partly for economic reasons, and that their act would do much to eliminate directly those economic reasons—and indirectly and partially the other reasons. No one denies that the preservation of psychological neutrality requires still other measures. But the critics want a whole loaf or nothing, and their constant use of the "perfectionist fallacy" in every polemical bout has focused the public's eye on possible defects and loopholes, made it completely overlook the tremendous improvement over that which has

gone before. A good—though not absolute—guarantee, which will exclude some of the material factors that dragged us into the last war, is certainly better than no guarantee at all for the next war.

Any valid attack on neutrality legislation must confine itself to the sphere of causation in which the law is supposed to operate, with the constant qualification that the failings of the 1937 Act are simply the failings of the 1937 Act, and not necessarily of any Act *per se*. Of course without a constitutional amendment, Congress will still hold the power of ultimately declaring war, a war into which the Executive under his present position in the conduct of foreign affairs can literally maneuver the country. That is precisely why discretionary presidential power to apply, or not to apply, the 1937 Act in its most vital aspect (the general embargo provisions of Section 2 apart from those on arms, ammunition and implements of war) cries for radical revision. A clause which reads: "The President may from time to time change, modify, or revoke in whole or in part any proclamations issued by him under the authority of this section," is not merely a compromise but a dangerous sham, a basic perversion, inviting those very conflicts over discriminatory national action which a sound program seeks to avoid.

"But mandatory legislation would strait-jacket our foreign policy!", rises the inevitable cry of protest. Yes, in certain aspects, but those are precisely the aspects in which it should be strait-jacketed. Threats of economic discrimination and reprisals must be backed by the ultimate threat of war; and it is sheer contradiction and general wooziness to announce that foreign trade is not worth fighting about, and then to give our Chief Executive authority to use the same thing as a coercive weapon inviting armed retaliation.

Permitting the entire original application of the Act to hinge on the President's finding "that there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more foreign states," is another gaping hole which needs plugging. However anomalous the legal status of the Japanese "North China incident," "punitive expedition," "war for peace," or what have you, the dangerous privilege of playing blind man's bluff with a major *de facto* war should not be left to an unstandardized individual judgment. Specifically enumerated categories of phenomena which constitute a war for the purpose of the Act, too definite to be frustrated on a technicality, will prevent any repetition of today's statutory muddle in the probably undeclared wars to come.

Only a few monomaniacs still think that J. P. Morgan and the Wall Street bankers, who floated ally loans, diabolically dragged us into the last war merely to salvage their money. In the first place the actual bonds were secured in gold; and the people who bought them, not the houses which sold them and cleared fat cash-commissions, stood to lose anyway. But students of the 1914-1917 period are agreed that the fear of inevitable economic crash in this country—upon the drying up of war-time ally demand, with a productive system artificially geared up to that demand—exercised

a potent influence on President Wilson. The famous Page letter aptly epitomized that fear. That is why loans are dangerous in any war. That is why a neutrality act must contain provisions for an automatic credit embargo. The 1937 law went that far, but that was not far enough; for sufficient foreign capital is scattered about the United States today—about \$7,700,000,000—to finance a war trade equivalent to that of 1914-1917. The cash-and-carry policy, plus a system of export quotas based on normal peace-time averages, will solve this problem without resort to the more drastic method of impoundment.

Of course such a program will involve sacrifice of both potential and present trade. "See what will happen," expostulates the opposition, "you will sabotage our merchant marine, ruin our cotton farmers, shrink our general trade"—just as if these were startlingly new insights and discoveries, as if the neutrality act pluggers failed to realize before that economic sacrifices would be necessary. But having decided that trade, and even the inevitable cotton farmers as cotton farmers, are not worth fighting about, we can hardly be astonished when the bright young men announce that we actually will lose some trade if we are not willing to take the steps which lead to war. The essential point is that if we do fight, it will cost us tremendously more than any economic losses suffered by not being willing to fight. If all our foreign trade dried up—which it won't—the country would suffer. Certainly, but never to the extent of the one hundred odd billions, the moral chaos, the economic collapse, which the last war cost us.

Another focal point for criticism is the continued permission to trade with neutrals, over which much of our World War controversy with Britain arose. But since we are not likely to be dragged into war against the British anyway, a point of contention may not be an unmixed evil, a counteraction to our traditional pro-British sympathies. Besides, an adequate neutrality act will provide a system of export quotas at the source, both to prevent productive displacement in this country through increased transshipments, and to substitute a workable setup for the present impossible enforcement en route or through shipper's honor.

To label our position selfish isolationism is a sheer perversion of terms. We withdraw within no shell, refuse no legitimate peace-time association or communication, but merely view the world scene with unblinking realism. When the nations are ready for sincere, unhypocritical cooperation, we will be prepared to change our policy. But the nations are not ready today. Of course a revitalized neutrality act, as here suggested, leaves many unsolved problems. There are no panaceas floating around loose in the world today, and the best solution for everyone would be the complete avoidance of any war. But if one comes, it is certainly better to have the best possible neutrality act to solve some problems, than to return to the system which failed so dismally in 1917—which, in the last analysis, is all the opponents of neutrality have to offer as alternative. Except a crusade to save Moscow.

COMMUNISTS AT WASHINGTON

OFFICIALS in high position at Washington have been accused by witnesses, appearing before the Dies Committee, of membership and active participation in various Communist organizations. One of these officials is Oscar Chapman, assistant Secretary of Commerce, and another is Harry Lambertson, assistant Administrator of the Rural Electrification Project. Each is a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy, an association which, according to Congressman Mason, of Illinois, is used to promote Communism in this country.

On hearing of the charge, Mr. Chapman returned the stereotyped answer. "I've been very much interested in the cause," he wrote in the *New York Times*, "and I don't know of any Communists in the organization." As the *New York Journal* observed editorially, it is remarkable that a man, competent to hold a high position at Washington, should be so poorly informed as to the character of his associates in the League. The editor advises Mr. Chapman to "acquaint himself with the Communists to whom allegedly he lends the prestige of his office," and to aid him in this task, appends the names of Communists who are active in the League.

Among them are Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist party, James W. Ford, Communist candidate for vice-President in 1936, William Patterson, member of the National Committee of the Communists, C. A. Hathaway, editor of the *Daily Worker*, official Communist newspaper in New York, Max Redacht, of the Communist National Committee, A. A. Heller, contributing editor of the *Daily Worker*, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, head of the Women's Division of the Communists in New York, Anna Damon, of the Communist National Committee, Charles Krumbein, Secretary of the Communist party in New York, Angelo Herndon, national vice-chairman of the Young Communist League and member of the Communist National Committee, and Margaret Cowl, head of the Women's Department in the Communist party and member of the National Committee. "Does Mr. Chapman," asks the *Journal*, "expect anybody to believe that he 'does not know of any Communists in that organization'?"

As for Mr. Lambertson, it is interesting to observe that he has announced a campaign to recruit members for the League. Since he is a Federal official, it is but natural that he proposes to work among the Federal employees in Washington.

We hope that in all fairness Mr. Lambertson will inform these employees of the true character of the League. He might tell them, for instance, that the Communists regard the League as an excellent method of introducing the philosophy and practices of Lenin into this country, and that the most prominent Communists now before the public, headed by Earl Browder, are enthusiastic members. Incidentally, we trust that he, as well as Mr. Chapman, will report his work for the League to his superiors.

THE N. L. R. B.

FOR once Henry Ford and the A. F. of L. are found in agreement. The common ground of assent is their fear that the Labor Relations Board is exercising powers which no Federal agency should have. We are quite willing to make a third with the A. F. of L. and Mr. Ford, and in that position we are wholly disinterested. We have no case before the Board, nor are likely to have any. What we want is a judicial-minded Labor Board that will scrupulously respect the rights of every party before it, and that will not imperil organized labor's hard-won rights by wild and untenable claims.

INTO THE FURNACE

IT is never pleasant to read in the newspapers that Mrs. John Smith has just returned from Massachusetts where she has placed her daughter at Wellesley or Smith, or that she plans a trip to New York to enter her daughter at Vassar. It is not pleasant, because Mrs. Smith is a Catholic, or, at least, professes to be a Catholic. It is even less pleasant when Mr. Smith is one of these public officials who frequently address Communion breakfasts and other Catholic gatherings.

Mrs. Smith may have no academic reasons for her choice of a school for her daughter. She and her sort generally are strangers to such reasons. She has lifted her eye to the social world, and she proposes to use Smith, or Wellesley, or Vassar, as a ladder by which daughter may climb. Things of the mind have nothing whatever to do with her choice. True, she has some qualms of conscience, but they are so slight that she easily lays them. If a child is sent to a Catholic elementary or high school, she tells herself, it is quite proper to entrust her thereafter to a college which will do its best to uproot whatever the child has learned about religion and morality, replacing the early impressions with principles drawn from an atheistic system of philosophy.

So argues Mrs. Smith, but Pius XI does not agree with her. He thinks that the only school fit for a Catholic child, whether that school be elementary, secondary, or collegiate, is one of which the very soul is the Catholic religion. In his Encyclical *The Christian Education of*

AND FREE SPEECH

IF Mr. Henry Ford, or any other employer, cannot publish a pamphlet, or make a speech, about labor and labor unions without exposing himself to punishment by the Labor Board, then the Board should be curbed. Congress, it must be presumed, did not give this authority to the Board, for Congress itself lacks this power, since the Constitution forbids it to the Federal Government, and therefore to any and every Federal agency or board. The right of workers to form unions and to bargain collectively through representatives of their choice should be put beyond all interference by crackpots.

E FURNACE OF FIRE

Youth he writes that to be "a fit place for Catholic students"

it is necessary that all the teaching and the whole organization of the school, and its teachers, syllabus, and text-books in every branch be regulated by the Christian spirit, under the direction and maternal supervision of the Church, so that religion may be in very truth the foundation and crown of the youth's entire training, and this in every grade of school, not only the elementary, but the intermediate and the higher institutions of learning as well.

Differing further with Mrs. Smith, who avers that at college her daughter will meet with nothing that could possibly be harmful to Faith or morals, the Pontiff quotes with approbation the judgment of the Italian Liberal, Tommaseo: "The school, if not a temple, is a den." The school which Mrs. Smith has selected is assuredly not a temple.

Precisely how Miss Smith is to enlarge the precariously small store of religion she now possesses, is not made clear by Mrs. Smith, or by Mr. Smith, now busy on another Communion breakfast address. The elder Smiths provide for the physical welfare of their child with liberality, but they act as though they were not bound by that even more stringent law which obliges them to nurture her in religion.

It is not probable that the young lady will escape from this furnace of atheism unharmed, although once upon a time three youths were cast into a fiery furnace without scathe. But those who entrust their children to a non-Catholic school cannot look for a miracle.

SOVIET PRIMARIES

SEEKING re-election, against the wishes of the President, Congressman O'Connor, of New York, summed up a phase of constitutional theory in a few words when he remarked, "A Congressman owes no allegiance to the President." That is absolutely true. The first allegiance of Congressmen is to their oath of office, and that makes no mention of the President. They "shall be bound by oath or affirmation," the Constitution provides in Article VI, "to support this Constitution." To include allegiance to the President is as absurd as to assert that every member of Congress owes allegiance to the Chief Justice of the United States.

If we are at pains to make this point, it is not because of any interest in the campaign of Mr. O'Connor. He can take care of himself, and both he and we know that were he forced to rely upon our efforts, he would be lost. But it seems to us that in these days of shifting standards, Mr. O'Connor's simple remark contains a valuable principle for which, as Americans, we must fight.

Some of us have no patience with the claim that the American people have given "a mandate" to the President, of which the chief provision is that every man in Congress, or in any Federal or State office, must support every measure proposed by the President, on pain of being driven from public life. No such claim is possible under the American system of government. What the people can do, and wish to do, they have recorded in the Constitution. That document will be searched in vain for any trace of the mandate theory.

By establishing a three-fold form of Government and by assigning to every one its limited sphere of authority, the people have created three departments of Government. These are coordinate, it is true, but not subordinated one to the other; independent, yet all working together to fulfil the purposes of the Constitution. Government by mandate has its home in Moscow and in Berlin, but not in the American Constitution.

If a member of Congress is bound to vote for every measure proposed by the President, who at the time is a member of his party, all authority given to Congress by the Constitution passes, because of that obligation, from Congress to the Executive. The shift destroys, obviously, one of the branches created by the Constitution. But if the mandate extends to Congress, it necessarily extends to the courts. In that case, we have not the Government established by the Constitution, nor a government of laws carefully limited by Congress, and interpreted with impartiality by the courts, but a government by one man.

As Senator Tydings said in his address on August 21, under the mandate theory the vote of the Congressman "on any and all questions will be the personal property of the President of the United States." By necessary implication, the vote of the Justices of the Supreme Court would also become his property. But neither be the property of the President of the United States, for it is plain, in the

dreadful situation here contemplated, that the United States would have ceased to exist as a constitutional government.

Not many months ago, the President assured the country that he had no interest in any of the primaries of 1938. He has since amended that statement. The President of the United States is not interested, but the head of the Democratic party conceives that he may speak his mind to the people in any State in which an election may be in progress, advising them whom to choose, whom to reject. It is, of course, impossible for the President of the United States to divest himself of the high office which he holds. Whatever he may address himself to, he is always the President of the United States. This fact gives substantial reality to Senator Tyding's charge that he is "running against the power of the Federal Government directed against me by the Chief Executive."

Here, in our opinion, is an issue no less serious than that which confronted Lincoln in 1861. The issue then was the supremacy in its field of the Federal Government. The issue today is the supremacy of the several States in the field reserved to them by the Constitution, and in particular, the right of the people to choose their representatives in Congress free from all Federal interference.

For years after the War between the States, the people of the South, barred from the polls by bayonets, saw their representatives chosen for them by military dictators. Are we to behold, after sixty years, a revival of this Federal domination? Are the power of the Federal Government, and the influence which it exercises through Federal patronage, to be marshaled to force the election to Congress of candidates who will vote, not in accord with their oath of office, and their conscientious regard for the common welfare, but, to quote Senator Tydings, "solely and only for the legislation and policies that may be proposed by the Chief Executive, no matter what their character"?

If we must fall to that base impotence, then let us cast no look of condescending pity upon Moscow or Berlin. For we ourselves are in a plight hardly less pitiable.

CIVIL SERVICE

DON'T take the Federal civil service too seriously. The boys in Washington really did tie a string to it. With this advice, the holder of a high office under the system concludes a letter.

The advice is unnecessary. We are very serious in our efforts to help in establishing an honest and intelligent Federal civil-service system. But we do not take the system as it now exists "too seriously," or even seriously. It is not civil service, but a Pharisaic tomb, outwardly fair, but inwardly full of rotten politicians.

The maintenance or destruction of these shocking conditions depends upon Congress. A fearless and persevering leader in Congress could bring reform appreciably nearer. But in these hectic days, who wants reform?

THE THANKFUL SAMARITAN

ONE of the first lessons to be learned by teachers, clergymen, kind-hearted physicians, and all who are frequently called upon to put themselves out for others, is not to look for gratitude. They may congratulate themselves if they escape slander. Human nature has many admirable qualities, and these can manifest themselves in an heroic degree at the most unexpected times. But in the daily run of life, we do not often meet with genuine gratitude, that pleasant balm to the heart, which all love, and few really learn to do without. Curiously, too, it would seem that the most actively benevolent rarely get it. "I had not only been kind to him," Thackeray once said in naive astonishment, "but he was grateful." "He was generally so civil," wrote Boswell of Johnson, "that no one ever thought of thanking him for it."

The Gospel which the Church reads tomorrow (Saint Luke xvii, 11-19) may remind us that while Almighty God is always civil to us, His wayward, foolish children, we hardly ever think of thanking Him for it. Saint Luke tells the story of the ten lepers who stood afar off as Our Lord went by on His way to Jerusalem, and "lifted up their voice, saying: Jesus, master, have mercy on us." On other occasions Our Lord had passed on as though He did not hear, and had turned to the suppliant only after repeated petition, but here He did not hesitate. "Go show yourselves to the priests," He bade the lepers, conforming to the ordinance of Moses; "and it came to pass that as they went they were made clean." But the point of the story is that only one of the ten came back to thank Our Lord, "and this was a Samaritan." "Were not ten made clean?" asked Jesus. "And where are the nine? There is no one found to return, and give glory to God but this stranger."

Is there one of us who can say that he always takes example from this thankful Samaritan? Too often we know only one kind of prayer, and that is a petition for some temporal favor. We do not know that a form of prayer which the Church continually uses, and recommends to us, is the prayer of thanksgiving. Every day in the Preface of the Mass she calls upon us to give thanks to God, and admonishes us: "It is truly meet and just, right and profitable for us at all times and in all places to give thanks to Thee, O Lord, the Holy One, the Father Almighty, the Everlasting God." The Church prays in our name; but would it not be well for us to get down on our knees from time to time, and in our own words thank God for the many blessings He bestows upon us?

Day after day and through the night, God shields us from many dangers to body and to soul, and gives us all that we need to attain everlasting happiness. Like ill-bred children we take His goodness as something due to us; at least we rarely if ever thank Him. Good mothers are wont to teach their little ones to say "thank you," in return for every civility. Let us turn to Mary, Our Mother, and ask her to teach us the habit of saying "thank you" to God.

CHRONICLE

THE ADMINISTRATION. President Roosevelt denounced participation by Republicans in Democratic primary elections, declared such participation violated political morality. Mr. Roosevelt said 15,000 to 20,000 Republicans entered the Democratic primaries in Idaho. Senator Pope, supported by the President, was defeated; Representative Clark, who promised he would not be a "yes man" for the Administration, elected. Idaho's Republican State chairman, Fred Babcock, said there were 3,000 more votes cast in the primary for the Democratic nomination for Governor than for the Senatorial nomination, showing that Republicans did not enter the Democratic primary in large numbers to defeat Senator Pope. . . . In Maryland, Senator Tydings, high on the Administration's "purge" list, scored President Roosevelt's "invasion" of State elections, his "dictation" to the voters. Election of a "rubber stamp" Congress will spell the end of the people's sovereignty, Mr. Tydings maintained. He declared success of the present Administration "purge" would mean revival of the Supreme Court battle. . . . Representative John J. O'Connor, also marked for defeat by the Administration, declared Mr. Roosevelt's "purge" is an "escalator to dictatorship," asked what is the difference between "yes men" Congress, and none at all. . . . Speaking in Kingston, Canada, Mr. Roosevelt said: "I give you my assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire." . . . President Roosevelt, in a discussion with A. F. of L. President, William Green, admitted that the National Labor Relations Act was in need of revision. . . . Secretary Hull in another note to Mexico declared that failure to make "effective payment" for expropriated land constitutes "unadulterated confiscation," which the American Government cannot condone. The note reiterated demands that the Mexican Government pay approximately \$10,000,000 for the farm-land property that had been confiscated from American owners.

AT HOME. Daniel J. Doherty, national commander of the American Legion, called on delegates to the Pennsylvania Legion convention to initiate a "purge of the indoctrinators and propagandists now masked as teachers in our American public schools and universities." . . . William Green, president of the A. F. of L., declared the Latin-American Trade Union Congress, to open in Mexico City on September 5, is a vehicle of "extreme leftists" to spread Communism through the Western Hemisphere. The A. F. of L. refused to send any representative to the Congress, Mr. Green revealed. . . . Senator George L. Berry, defeated for renomination in Ten-

nessee, filed with the Senate Committee on Campaign Expenditures charges that WPA employes had been assessed \$125,000, which was used against him. He declared there was a "gigantic expansion" of WPA and relief rolls during the month before the primary.

DIES COMMITTEE. Before the Congressional Committee investigating un-American activities, J. B. Matthews, of Washington, N. J., formerly head of the American League Against War and Fascism, which later changed its name to the American League for Peace and Democracy, testified that it was "born in Moscow" in 1933. The fact that the American League for Peace and Democracy "recently obtained the endorsement of the Solicitor General of the United States," shows its influence, Mr. Matthews said. The American Youth Congress, which has just been host to the World Youth Congress at Vassar College, is just one of the many Communist "fronts" in the United States, the witness declared. Regarding the American League for Peace and Democracy, Mr. Matthews revealed: "The decision to set it up was actually made in Moscow. . . . The prelude to an American Popular Front. Earl Browder brought back the word from Moscow. And I was chosen by Browder and his colleagues in the Communist party to head the new organization." Continuing the witness said: "When a Communist maneuver is skillful enough to establish any kind of a connection between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Communist party, it is hardly to be wondered at that we were able to fool thousands of others about the character of the league." Referring again to the World Youth Congress at Vassar, Mr. Matthews declared it "is nothing more or less than one of these 'united front' maneuvers dedicated to forwarding the aims of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." Communist growth has been swifter in the last few years than had been hoped for in fifty, Mr. Matthews asserted. It is a matter of "pride and boasting" among Communists that the party has "its friends, and sympathizers situated strategically in every important institution in this country—government agencies, newspapers, magazines, the churches, women's clubs, trade unions, universities and colleges and in industry," he testified. The "cry of red baiting is the best trick ever invented, short of a firing squad, for making short work of anybody who dares to object to Communist theories or practices. . . . A twentieth-century American 'liberal' would rather face the charge of slapping his grandmother than to be accused of red baiting," Mr. Matthews declared. He asked and obtained police protection for the remainder of his stay at the National Capital.

SPAIN. General Franco uncompromisingly rejected the British plan for the withdrawal of volunteers in a note which demanded the granting of belligerent rights before withdrawing any troops. He rejected the scheme for sea control in Spanish ports and refused the plan for frontier air control. He expressed, however, his willingness to grant an unprecedented concession to the enemy, the safeguarding of two safety ports for food ships in Loyalist Spain. . . . Another concession was the offer of cooperation with the object of defining and limiting "as far as may be practicable the conception of military objectives in relation to aerial bombardments." . . . The Burgos reply repeated its former assurance that it is not sold out to Germany and Italy. "National Spain solemnly reiterates its former affirmations that it is fighting for the greatness and independence of the country, and does not consent, and will never consent, to the slightest mortgage on its soil, or on its economic life, and that it will defend at all times to the last handful, its territory, its protectorates and its colonies if any one dares make an attempt against them." . . . The Estramadura offensive has netted 500 additional square miles for the Nationalists, with the capture of ten towns in the week ending Aug. 20. . . . On the Ebro front Franco troops broke through the enemy lines to menace the last bridgehead held on the west bank.

GREAT BRITAIN. The Franco rebuff on British proposals was taken phlegmatically by Downing Street. An appeal to General Franco for "elucidation" of his note was considered as probably England's next move. Prevailing opinion held that Franco's note was reasonably practical and conciliatory enough to permit further discussions toward the solution of the Spanish problem. . . . Britain, observers declared, is finding herself powerless to cope with the present reign of terror in Palestine. After two and a half years of Arab terrorism the rebellious elements continue to grow stronger. Arab politicians have taken advantage of the Mohammedan's religious fanaticism to further their own ambitions, and are making the issue not one of nationalism, but of the survival of the cult for which the desert tribes express their willingness to die. . . . Hebron was the scene of a fierce battle between British troops and Arab rebels who swooped down from the hills. Jews in Palestine begged to be allowed to join the British in the defense of Jerusalem against a threatened Arab attack.

SINO-JAPANESE WAR. The Japanese strategy in the advance toward Hankow appeared to have changed to a vast enveloping movement involving the cutting of Lung-Hai railway and the stopping of arms shipments from Russia via Shensi Province. . . . Tokyo planes forced down an airliner carrying passengers, twelve of whom were machine-gunned as they sought flight. . . . Fear of Russia and the cost of war are hampering Tokyo's offensive, it was disclosed in a frank statement by a Japanese offi-

cial. . . . Organized Christianity in Japan is to be placed on an equal footing with Buddhism and secular Shinto if the plan being drafted by a committee of fifty-four is accepted by the Minister of Education. The reason for the step is the Government's belief that there should be a closer connection between it and the Christian churches, coupled with recognition of the long and successful record in social service work and in introducing Western culture made by Christianity in Japan.

FRANCE. Backed by the executive committee of his own Radical Socialist party, Premier Daladier proceeded with his proposals to modify the application of the forty-hour-week law so as to permit overtime at ten per cent above the normal wage rates. . . . Two Ministers quit the Government on the work issue, alleging their disagreement with the Premier's stand. . . . The Premier insisted that French industry must run on a forty-eight-hour week basis as long as "the international situation remains as delicate as it is." . . . Financiers welcomed the Daladier denial that the franc would be further devalued and exchange controlled.

ITALY. Fascists gave up their ban on Catholics, agreeing to reinstate in the party those ousted for joining Catholic Action. . . . The Holy Father, despite the settlement, continued his outspoken condemnation of arch-nationalism, terming it a veritable curse. "Particularly for missions," the Pontiff said, "exaggerated nationalism means the cause of sterility, because it is not by that road that the fertility of divine grace pours into souls."

GERMANY. The Canadian address of President Roosevelt was interpreted by Berlin to mean that the United States could be counted on to come to the aid of the "democracies" in any future war and thus to make the combination against Germany overwhelming. The press headlined it as the "Warlike Speech of Roosevelt Against Imaginary Dangers." . . . The trial of Former Chancellor Schuschnigg has again been postponed, this time till after the Nuremberg Congress. The charge will be treason and the possible penalty beheading. . . . Germany expelled a British official, Captain Kendrick, on a spying charge, alleging the misuse of "mail-bags." . . . Although the tax rate has more than doubled since the advent of Hitler, the Reich was still spending at the rate of more than a billion marks monthly above its income, it was revealed in a startling report by Dr. Schacht. . . . A list of Jewish names that must be given to all non-Aryans was released officially. There are 185 licit first names for males and 91 for females. They include such unattractive names as Ansel, Chanoch, Zadek for boys and Brocha, Pessel, Slowe and Zorthel for girls. . . . Admiral Horthy, Regent of Hungary, inspected the sea might of the Reich in a naval parade at Kiel. For an hour he stood at attention with Hitler as 110 ships of modern design steamed past.

CORRESPONDENCE

MARRIAGE LEGISLATION

EDITOR: The substitution of marriage legislation, as a means of combating those diseases spread mostly by immorality, for the customary methods of preventing disease by public health education, seemed peculiar at its inception.

Another peculiar aspect of the substitution is that one of the two diseases, singled out as so dangerous to offspring as to justify the barring of a marriage, produces sterility.

Since the law became effective in this city, the great decrease in the number of applications for licenses to wed seems to indicate that the new requirements are so embarrassing to young couples that the majority, which does not regard marriage as a Sacrament, may be tempted to dispense with all formalities.

Obviously, legislation cannot prevent common-law marriages, and hence, its real effect is confined mostly to religious ceremonies where, because of acknowledged moral obligations, the need of civic control is apt to be least. The possibility of common-law marriages ultimately becoming more numerous than divorces, with far more serious moral, social and physical consequences, probably will lead to repeal of the prohibition or an exemption to it, for those affiliated with the religious body authorizing the marriage and exercising spiritual jurisdiction over both parties.

New York, N. Y.

HENRY V. MORAN

OUR MONETARY POLICIES

EDITOR: Congratulations on the Lawrence Lucey article on Money. Some may hold it a mere "crackpot" theory, but when national authorities such as Irving Fisher and Robert H. Hemphill hold the solution of money and banking the starting point for all other economic reforms, any such reasoned, factual and impartial articles are news indeed and as worthy of space as the latest wrinkle of the Nazi Nordic forehead. I am afraid that we look so much to Europe that we forget our own problems.

Irving Fisher is said to know more about money than any man in the United States. Robert H. Hemphill was former credit manager of the Federal Reserve at Atlanta. Both were consulted by Congress (cf. House hearings on "Banking Act of 1935" 74th Congress, 1st sess., H. R. 5357).

Monetary affairs may be difficult to the uninitiated and perhaps *in se*. Or we lacked men who would simplify this knowledge and face facts. But we have tried most other remedies. Yet no one would say economic conditions are healthy. Edwin W. Kemmerer of Princeton in *Kemmerer On Money* admitted that the system was defective.

Marriner S. Eccles, Governor of the privately owned Federal Reserve, before the above Committee, admitted the same. So let's have more about monetary symptoms.

Truth has only one side. A thing is either true or false under the same aspect at the same time. We may not be able to distinguish so well in the twilight zone, but truth will out if we calmly and scientifically face facts.

Banks hold about 20- of the 37-billion Federal debt. Local governments and other borrowers owe the banks billions more. The origin of these loans far above the five to ten billions of actual cash in the United States make a joke of the Arabian Nights.

The President intimated that the contraction of credit by the Federal Reserve early in 1937 was a mistake. About two billions in contracted credit multiplied by its circulation as check-book money comes to six billions in reduced medium of exchange and the Roosevelt "recession." The President proposed a complete reversal: more credit, more exchange media, more business; i.e. the removal of the bankers' deflation: the Roosevelt depression. Already this policy with other expenditures is starting a boom.

Certainly, these policies are worthy of attention when they have such a profound effect on our livelihood. The bankers are not disinterested. It is their business. But they solicit our deposits and loans. Therefore, it is our business. And remember the destitute. So far we have not been satisfied with the bankers' apologia.

Furthermore credit is a topic of *Quadragesimo Anno*. And the American Hierarchy recommended a further study of money.

Woodstock, Md.

FRANCIS J. WAGNER

EXCEPTION

EDITOR: I hope most earnestly that the editors of AMERICA will take exception to the opinions expressed in the letter captioned *More Nationalism* (August 20), and signed by J. H. B. Hoffmann.

Cultural nationalism, inasmuch as it provides a modicum of spiritual haven for a materialistic generation, is a splendid thing and should be encouraged. No one wishes national diversity to be replaced by a drab cosmopolitan uniformity. But, the indiscriminate championing of nationalism, with all its political, economic and ethnical complications, is a dangerous pastime for a Catholic. One of the chief marks of all nationalism is hatred and distrust of the foreigner, and the man who has ties binding him to the allegiance, spiritual or temporal, of a foreign state. From the Know-Nothings to the Black Legion, one of the chief marks of exagger-

ated American nationalism is anti-Catholicism. Mr. Hoffmann himself writes: "The chief antagonism to the Catholic Church in America is nationalistic rather than religious." Yet he advises us to add fuel to the flames of nationalism!

The melting pot is still at the boiling point; the Americans do not constitute a separate people. The Americans, if a nation, are a mongrel nation. Yet there is a strong American nationalism. It is, for the most part, kept in its proper place. England, a nation whose nationalism is rational, not merely emotional, is another example of a nation that has made a proper evaluation of nationalism and placed it in its proper place.

To mark out the Jews, and then the Negroes—to label them as minorities to be given special treatment—is a course fraught with danger to American Catholics. We are the next minority. It would be a mistaken policy, a great error, for the Church to foster nationalism.

Woodstock, Md. FRANCIS X. CURRAN, S.J.

AND HE IS ANSWERED

EDITOR: I hope you will accord me the privilege of replying to the letter of F. C. Brown, printed in your issue of August 13, first because I am not one of those Irish who in Mr. Brown's estimation were so nobly benefited by prohibition, for not a drop of Irish blood courses through my veins, and secondly because Mr. Brown seems to be overly concerned because Protestants do not understand why the Catholic Church in America was opposed to prohibition. Besides, I happen to be an ex-Protestant.

It is certainly true as stated by Mr. Brown that milk, whiskey, opium and rat poison are all gifts of God, and each of them were given to man to be used. They are all good in themselves and become evil only when misused by man. Surely Mr. Brown would not contend, because some few persons chose to overload their stomachs with milk, that milk itself is evil and that all cows should be shot.

Man of all God's creatures was the only one to be endowed with the power of free will. He may take one or twenty-one glasses of whiskey, or he may exercise his will power and take none. The Catholic Church does not consider it evil for him to take one, if he can afford it without depriving himself or family. However, if he knows that that one drink will lead him on to taking more than he should, then the Church says that he should avoid even that one. The position of the Church is, however, that if a man should abstain he should abstain from choice and not because he is forced to do so.

Mr. Brown wonders if it wouldn't have been better for AMERICA to have been proud of having cleared some Irish names of booze joints, "as prohibition did." Did it? And why pick on the Irish? Irish were not and are not the only ones to frequent the booze joints. Such places were and are frequented by nearly all races including Ameri-

cans, and by those of all religions and none, during prohibition and since.

Surely, as Mr. Brown contends, Catholic drunks mean Catholic poor and unprovided Catholic homes, but all drunks are by no means Catholics nor are all poor and unprovided homes Catholic poor or Catholic homes. Did Protestant-sponsored prohibition prevent Protestant drunks and Protestant poor and unprovided homes?

Mr. Brown bewails the fact that these conditions are a blight on Catholics and give them a bad name. To me a drunk just looks like a drunk. Perhaps these good-living Protestants of whom Mr. Brown speaks have some magic method of learning whether the drunks they see are Catholics or what not. If a Catholic chooses to be drunk it is not because of the fact that he is a Catholic but in spite of it. The Church has always been most outspoken against intemperance in all things, not alone drinking. She, however, chooses to try to appeal to man's better nature by encouraging him to use the will power that God gave him rather than try to reform him by force. She knows that God provides the graces for man to overcome every temptation if he will but use them.

New York, N. Y.

WILLIAM E. MASSEY

MISINTERPRETED

EDITOR: Your article under *Comment* (August 6) concerning the Anti-Moth-Ball Society of St. Stephen's Church in Philadelphia, is extremely distasteful to those of us who are acquainted with Dr. Hart and his work among the young people.

The person responsible for the article has directly misinterpreted the spirit and purpose of Dr. Hart's activities. The Anti-Moth-Ball Society has nothing to do with the regular church services, but offers the young people of the church the opportunity of keeping together for recreational programs during the summer months, whereas in former years all societies of the church discontinued activities during the summer. In a mood of high good fun and fellowship, Dr. Hart last summer organized the Anti-Moth-Ball Society when the young people of St. Stephen's complained because the Community House was closed to them during a period when they considered they needed it as much as ever.

Of course, the religious services of the church go on as usual. How anyone could confuse the function of a society with such a humorous name as "Anti-Moth-Ball" with the regular functions of the church is beyond me. It is difficult, too, to reconcile the spirit of this article in AMERICA with the generous spirit of Monsignor Hawkes, of the St. Joan of Arc Parish in Philadelphia, and with that of Father O'Hare, of Old St. Joseph's Church, both of whom addressed our Forum recently. (The Forum, incidentally, is part of the Anti-Moth-Ball Society's activity.) These two Catholic gentlemen endeared themselves to us by their splendid interpretation of the problems we were considering.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ISABEL R. MACMILLAN

LITERATURE AND ARTS

THE ANGEL OF RHEIMS WINS BACK HIS SMILE

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

AN overwhelming desire comes to the mind in visiting the ancient cathedrals of France. Would that one could see, in the flesh, speaking, working, struggling and disputing if need be, the men who brought these incredible edifices into being! This side of Jordan, the desire will never be gratified; but as near an approach to it as is possible came at the festival of the inauguration of the Cathedral of Rheims, on July 10 of this year.

The affair began by the inauguration of the great organ on the eve of the festival. Every available spot in the vast nave, and around the choir of the Cathedral—a choir built extra long for the former coronation ceremonies—was occupied by an immense throng of listeners, tensely silent, apparently carried away with the solemnity of the occasion. The Archbishop of Rheims, Cardinal Suhard, with bishops and archbishops and major and minor clergy occupied the interior of the choir. Far up in a corner just hither of the high altar sat a bearded layman, Henri Deneux, the architect of the restored Cathedral. This was a man who for twenty years has lived like a monk a life of utter detachment and consecration to duty, eating, sleeping, working, dreaming within the ruins and the restored walls of the Cathedral of Rheims.

For an entire year Henri Deneux did nothing but study and classify the ruins. What he then accomplished is so huge a work of technical construction combined with archeological restoration that it would take a volume to describe it. Modern technical devices came to his aid, particularly in the construction of the concrete girders which support the vaults and roof. Tiny as to relative size, but tremendous in the popular imagination was the restoration of the head of the decapitated Smiling Angel of the central portico.

The Angel, so they explained to me, had kept his enigmatic smile through five centuries of French history, which were enough to wear the smile from a stone image. He had never let himself become discouraged by the worried expression of his venerable neighbor, Saint Nicaise. He smiled upon Joan of Arc as he smiled upon all France's monarchs before and since during that long period. Even Gambetta

and Combes and the "lay laws" never quenched his optimism. It took the World War to accomplish in an instant what ages of weather from above and human conflict from below had never been able to encompass.

So much has been and will be said about the famous *sourire de Reims* that I realize it is definitely not an original theme. If I wished to wander down a by-alley of thought, I should follow up notions that came to me in listening to that organ concert where M. Deneux remained immobile, under the shadow of spiritual and physical majesty. Here in synthesis was the whole French nation, Catholic France, her clergy and laity, with a sprinkling, that would grow the next day to good proportion, of the theoretically hostile non-Catholic body. It was all ineffably solemn. For an hour, for two hours, not a sound, not a move from that multitude, save when some chairs were turned around for the Cardinal and his suite to better listen to a brief discourse delivered from the pulpit.

All sat in this cosmic tension, as if waiting for the Last Judgment, as if waiting for those saints and prophets, evangelists and apostles, those kings and queens to come down from their eminences, for the dead hierarchs to rise with crozier and mitre from their tombs, for the rose windows to burst into eternity, for the final apparition of Him for whom all this was built. And what were they occupied with? Listening to a little melody that came from some infinitely remote corner in an unseen organ loft in the north transept; something conceived years ago in the mind of César Franck; a little searching melody, a bit of minor plaintiveness that pleaded and pleaded again, always coming back to a wordless request; a reminder of eighteenth-century minuets, of tunes played by a great-great-grandmother on a vanished harpsichord, of a distilled quintessence of some discreet folksong, falling and rising, varying and recurring, always soft, always gentle, yet penetrating relentlessly through a hundred arches and vaults in the vast temple of the kings of France.

This very small matter, this reverence paid to extreme littleness, was in a way a more significant

homage to the historic past than the elaborate doings that preceded and followed the great celebration of the Solemn Mass in the Cathedral on the following morning. The honor paid to the dead organist was like the kiss proffered to a sovereign's hand. At the great celebration, which the daily press has sufficiently described, you were chiefly occupied by innumerable manifestations of an extraordinary truce that now exists in so many areas of French life between official enemies but practical friends; a truce symbolized by the nonchalance with which Papal yellow and white and the tricolor of the Republic waved side by side through the streets of Rheims. But it took four years of German bombing to lay the foundations for that truce; and it is the verbal bombshells still exploding across the eastern border that keep it up.

But what the past meant in its signification for the present was revealed in all eloquence Sunday night when two plays, a medieval mystery play of *Adam and Eve* and Henri Ghéon's historical sequence, the *Great Days of Rheims* (*Le Jeu des Grandes Heures de Reims*), were performed before the porch of the Cathedral. Stars of the Parisian stage were requisitioned for these events. Bishop Rémi was played by Arquillière, president of the Catholic actors of France, with the voice and frame of a pipe organ; Joan of Arc by Gisèle Casadesus, of the Comédie Française, etc., while various dramatic organizations and orchestras carried the bulk of the program and the big registers resounded at frequent opportune moments from within the Cathedral.

M. Massiani, correspondent of the N.C.W.C. News Service, and myself were perched high on the benches that were filled to capacity in the square in front of the church. We both agreed that the highest point in the entire program was the moment when the Narrator, P. J. Delbos, who was as superb in his volcanic fashion as was Frank Craven in his genial style a couple of months earlier in *Our Town*, when the Narrator, after reciting to the Youths and Maidens of Rheims, the chorus of the Mystery, all the struggles and sorrows and labors and hopes of the workmen and artists, the monarchs and soldiers, the saints and scholars who had built this great shrine to the Hidden God—then turned to them with one sweeping gesture, pointing to the illuminated portals over their heads, and exclaimed, "But what they did is THIS, that you now see before you!"

"What they did is *this*!" That was all you needed for the rest of the evening. M. Massiani, who was away from his seven children and uncertain where he could find a lodging for the night, and myself were cold and sleepy around midnight, when clergy are said to seldom wander abroad in French provincial towns. But we both experienced what, as we noticed, was the case of most of the auditors when the Mystery was over—we could not bring ourselves without one last, delayed, and painful effort to turn our backs upon the spectacle of that illuminated Cathedral. The dramatizations of the historic scenes were like most of those affairs; your imagination creaks a bit in seeing revivals of heroes and

heroines, though Joan of Arc did make a hit when she walked straight down through the aisles from the rear of the audience, coming from the same direction that she followed when she first came to Rheims. What captured the mind was the immediate juxtaposition of past and present, such a past and such a present. I should have wished to have had more of this feature of the Mystery, as when the Narrator personally conducted Rheims' Youths and Maidens, young folk clad in the peasant garb of Champagne, from figure to figure in the three great portals, and told them quite simply the meaning of it all. And the Angel with his enigmatic smile came in, of course, for a proper mention.

The good Lord knows, by His Providence, how to mix the ingredients for life's mysteries. The stark tragedy of Rheims needed some such alleviation; and, were it not for the little things that give some trifling peace and joy, how could the human mind hold out against the fearful realities which Rheims so terrifically recalls? For the very majesty of the Cathedral it is most fitting that it should be framed in the architectural moderation of the Champagne region; gracious buildings with but two or three stories, with even proportions, gentle outlines, a calm and human background for those calcined towers lifting to Heaven their eternal witness against the unspeakable horrors of war.

It was not well to be too reflective. Not well to let the mind rove still further, out upon the battlefields of the Great War where Rheims for four years of agony was the invincible salient; where almost under the spires of the Cathedral American boys lie buried by the thousands side by side with German and French lads and many another from other lands; that land which still freezes the soul with its silence crying to deaf humanity. Not well to let the mind rove still further, to other Cathedrals like Rheims, other marvels of ages of Faith and devotion, ruined beyond repair even of a genius like Henri Deneux, in the war-cursed lands below the Pyrenees. Will peace return to them as well?

Better to forget it all, in the spirit of the occasion, and let eye and mind rest on the gorgeous rose-windows, with their crown of a pointed opening above the rose, or upon the gilded fleur-de-lis again glittering in the summer sunshine above the roof of the Cathedral. Better to thank God that with a thousand reasons for grief and regret, France at least has one great thing, she has liberty; narrow liberty, if you wish, liberty that limps, particularly on the educational foot, but still liberty for the Church to live and work, liberty for her Catholic youth to win back the Faith, liberty to show that unconquerable spirit that the Mystery play proclaimed, liberty to build a new France not patterned upon the old, but saving the glory of the old, such glory as is not all just *gloire* and parade, but the true inner glory of a tremendous faith and sanctity that raised up vast armies of noble souls to God. The Church in France has again learned to smile. While the smile may be a bit wan, it will grow to exultation in a few years if things turn no worse. Such may be the lesson of Rheims taught by the Angel who has won back his smile.

BOOKS

COMMUNISM, A RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

COMMUNISM AND MAN. By F. J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward. \$2

THAT Communism is not a mere economic theory but negatively a protest to Capitalism and positively a philosophy of human life and a religion, is the startling point of this book and furnishes the norm of its treatment. Otherwise its criticism would not produce an instant emotional reaction and it would on the contrary willingly commit its case to fair examination. The writer's analysis of the three types who compose the ranks of the Communists is keen.

How is this judicial examination of Communism to be attempted? Not by the Russian experiment, which is a particular case, but by an exposition of the fundamental elements in Communism to be found wherever it is introduced—a study of its leading idea. Following this, Mr. Sheed exposes its beginnings in Hegel, the Marxian adaptations of Dialectical Materialism, the Economic Interpretation of History, class war, classless society and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the second part, man is studied as a rational animal, dependent on God, and the logical deductions therefrom, whether favorable or otherwise to Communist tendencies. The clarity and simplicity of the author in these chapters is liable to appeal to many who are left untouched and uninfluenced by subtler disquisitions.

The third part examines the individual's worth in the light of Christian revelation. Maintaining alike simplicity, brevity and clarity, these chapters give the true, Christian answer to the problems that center on man's social and economic existence, when adequately considered. The fourth part, which is the more specific, interesting and valuable, outlines with like brevity and clarity the problem of social economic reform, its main elements and the Catholic answer, as expounded in the authoritative social Encyclicals of Leo and Pius. The failure of the leaders to take up the Papal standards and of the wealthy to range themselves under it, are rightly stressed in the concluding chapter by Mr. Sheed.

It is unfortunately true that the manner of acting in certain Catholic circles has done much to shake the faith of the working classes in the religion of Jesus Christ. These groups have refused to understand that Christian charity demands the recognition of certain rights due to the working man, which the Church explicitly acknowledged. (*Divini Redemptoris*)

There is place and need for this book. Mr. Sheed has well supplied the need as he appraised and delimited it. It should be recommended by priests to the laity, will aid the busy priest for lectures and sermons and will fill the special ends of evidence guilds and study clubs.

WILLIAM J. BENN

HUMAN EMOTIONS SKILFULLY PORTRAYED

IMAGES IN A MIRROR. By Sigrid Undset. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. \$2

AGAINST the background of the topsy-turvydom which some people make of marriage, and in contrast to it, Sigrid Undset has written a story of conjugal fidelity and its consequent happiness. It is the story of a "hus-

band and wife who hurt each other and loved each other, and who knew everything and nothing about each other,—as human beings hurt and love and do not know each other."

Uni Hjelde, who had once been an actress, loved her husband, Kristian, dearly. She had borne him five children, and after her last delivery was forced to go into the country alone for complete rest. While there she met Vegard Lüdgers, a friend of her pre-marriage years, who had wrecked his own married life and would have been quite willing to ruin her own. Innocuously enough he made love to her in the country by giving Uni those little attentions and flatteries which Kristian had long ago taken for granted. Thought of her faithful husband and their little brood had given Uni the strength to resist, though in some vague way she did admit to herself that Vegard filled up an emptiness in her life, of whose presence she had been hitherto unconscious. He followed her to the city, persisted in his attentions, which Uni began to welcome. Just as she was about to allow things to become serious the beautiful resignation in suffering of a lonely and devoted friend pulled Uni up short. This was the beginning of a complete reconciliation with Kristian and a closer welding together of the Hjelde family ties for a more solid happiness.

As is her wont Sigrid Undset has solved her problem with convincing success. The characters with whom she has peopled her book are most human, living their lives like millions of others have lived and will live. No one will deny the author the claim to a keen understanding of human emotions and their reactions upon individuals. *Images in a Mirror* is a novel of human emotions that are intelligently handled in a deft and interesting portrayal of life and its problems. JOSEPH R. N. MAXWELL

A LESSON FROM GETTYSBURG

A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM. By Nicholas Roosevelt. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50

FROM the classical words at Gettysburg "that we here highly resolve . . . that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom," Mr. Roosevelt draws his title. It is developed in five sections: the struggle for liberty, the American way, the new reaction, how democracies die, resurgent federalism. Back in 1916, when he was an ex-President and did not love the contemporary President's ideas, Theodore Roosevelt declared that our nation had grown soft. In 1938, Mr. Nicholas Roosevelt of the same *gens* declares that "Americans today instead of depending on themselves, expect to be helped." Out of its context, the statement, is, one hopes, too universal.

Mr. Roosevelt himself pays tribute to our "self-reliable, independent, brave and generous men and women." But he would emphasize the earlier American spirit of "give me liberty or give me death." Paternalism leads too easily to some form of totalitarianism, and its mildest form anesthetizes personal and civic liberty. One such foreboding practice is running to Washington with local problems. Part of Mr. Roosevelt's thesis is that historically property has been the basis of freedom, and that prosperity demands not a restriction but an increase of property by production. He has a more penetrating diagnosis, for "America is spiritually atrophied—as is most of the rest of the world." It has "indifferent ears" to "the great lessons of religion."

Moral training has disappeared with the breakdown of the family. "Youth is thus floundering in a spiritually

sterile sea." The makeshift for religion, the schools, "do not provide a substitute for what the churches and the family used to give." Not even intellectually: "The schools have tended to pamper youth—to make things as pleasant and as easy for the children as possible." The classicists will agree with, while so-called progressive educators will blink at: "It is not through ease and escape from effort and responsibility that strong men and women are formed." Logically then, since the schools arouse no intellectual curiosity and develop no moral stamina, the "greatest curse" on us today is "idleness (not mere unemployment), and its bastard brother, irresponsibility . . . the enormous number of vacuous and stagnant hours with nothing to do which hang heavy on the youth of the land, and on many of their elders . . . they sap vitality and character."

Mr. Nicholas Roosevelt goes deep and to the fundamental difficulty: "Unless there is a great spiritual re-awakening, neither federalism (state rights and responsibilities), nor the restoration of property, nor the diffusion of ownership of the means of production will be of much avail." The author, a provocative social philosopher, is always a gentleman. He never attempts to rout his adversary by smearing him with some smart sobriquet. One may not always agree with Mr. Nicholas Roosevelt, but one always respects his sincere and cogent argumentation. There is need of this spirit in social legislation. It should not be one-sided in a democracy. Mr. Roosevelt's book is an intellectual and moral challenge to Americans. It could be "prescribed reading" in political economy for all collegiate, legislative and executive halls.

DANIEL M. O'CONNELL

POET, DIPLOMAT, AMBASSADOR, SAINT

SAINT CATHERINE OF SIENA. By Johannes Jorgensen. Longmans, Green and Co. \$3.50

TEN years ago the Catholic Book Club had the honor of presenting the *Autobiography* of the distinguished convert, Johannes Jorgensen, in an admirable translation by Mme. Ingeborg Lund. The present magnificent volume is offered as its August selection, and has the advantage of being rendered into English by the same translator from the original, published as companion to Jorgensen's *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi*.

Like its predecessor, this book is based on a study of original documents, but the casual reader will be grateful for the author's declared purpose of arranging his notes and references in an appendix, while the scholar will find in this supplement much of provocative value, especially the treatment of the Saint's ardent biographer and contemporary, Cafferini, who, with Raymond of Capua, is responsible for handing on the accessory details of a life which is best transmitted in Catherine's own letters. Of these Jorgensen has made his story, for an artist would be a fool to inject his own narrative too obtrusively into a chain of epistles which burn and sing and which communicate, not alone the history of a soul, but of an era.

When President Roosevelt appointed Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen as Minister to Denmark, she was hailed as the first woman diplomat. That feminist enthusiasm is the measure of our provincial American ignorance and of the need for the wide historic sweep of this volume. For the Sienese mystic, who lived transfixed with ecstasy, who nursed the leprous while she gave orders to Popes and kings, moved republics, condemned or transmitted inspired absolution to earth's mighty ones, was not only an ambassador but the effective political dictator of all Europe. All dreaded her because all felt her power, because from her radiated "the beatitude of the Crucifixion." All obeyed her because her diplomacy was keyed to a policy of forthright speech and not smothered by the "semantic" mouthings of current diplomatic palaver. When the Pope feared to leave Avignon because he

might be poisoned, Catherine pointed out that there was probably just as much poison in Avignon as Rome. When Gregory still vacillated she delivered her ultimatum: "Do not be a timid boy, be a man! Open your mouth and take the bitter for the sweet!"

No one was ever able to resist Catherine, not Gregory, not Raymond, not the English hermit, William of Flete, not any of the prostitutes or playboys who went to taunt and upbraid her and were abashed by her limpid glance—and not Johannes Jorgensen, who was at first repelled by her perpetual and very feminine *io voglio*, "I will." He lived in Siena to write this book and lived in communion with Catherine to try to weep with her the tears from which saints are born. His study of Catherine, the poet, is subtle and masterly. For she was a poet, like Francis, but was deeper and less naive. Despite her mystic flights, her comparisons, like those of Saint Teresa, are often humorous, as when she calls the breviary the priest's wife, because he always walks with it under his arm.

A final word of commendation goes to the publisher for a format in excellent taste and for cloaking the volume in the softness of Umbrian brown, with dust jacket in burnt Siena.

ALFRED BARRETT

BOOKS IN BRIEFER REVIEW

THE DOOMSDAY MEN. By J. B. Priestley. Harper and Bros. \$2.50

HERE is an incredible adventure story that is going to be immensely popular. Priestley has given his followers the perfect summer novel—exciting, pictorial, fantastic, and unfailingly humorous.

The threads of the plot are woven around three central figures: an English architect, Malcolm Darbyshire; an American physicist, George Hooker; and a world wanderer, Jimmy Edlin. Coincidentally their paths cross in Los Angeles and they discover that they are all interested in solving the mystery surrounding the Lost Lake citadel near Barstow—each, however, for a different reason.

A fanatic religious sect has caused the death of Edlin's brother for which he has vowed revenge—this sect has its headquarters at Lost Lake. A mad scientist is conducting weird experiments of world-wide proportions, about which Hooker is avidly curious—the secret is enclosed within the walls of the Lost Lake mansion. A beautiful girl, with whom the architect is in love, is a veritable prisoner in the same castle.

Besides unceasing activity in the story, Priestley has enriched the pages with delightful descriptive passages of desert beauty. Here should be a welcome addition to your "Couldn't-put-it-down-till-I-finished-it" shelf.

JANE FRANCES MULLEN

PARTS UNKNOWN. By Frances Parkinson Keyes. Julian Messner, Inc. \$2.50

NUMEROUS admirers of Mrs. Keyes' literary gifts will enjoy reading her latest novel which deals with the American diplomatic service in distant parts of the world, and describes the unusual romance of Michael Trent and a Virginian girl named Daphne Daingerfield.

From the first chapter with its locale in Alexandria, the story progresses with more than ordinary charm and interest. As a world-traveler and keen observer of facts, the author writes with conviction and accuracy of several foreign cities and of the numerous trials that beset the aspirant to success in the consular ranks of our government. Political intrigue and favoritism are described as too frequent factors in the appointments to office and in subsequent preferment. The fact that Michael finally surmounted most of these difficulties was not due so much to his own character or persistence as to the influence of a wealthy American friend and the

superior qualities and constancy of his young wife, whose dream was realized when her husband was chosen to become Ambassador of the United States at the Court of St. James.

The chapter entitled "Presidential Progress" fell somewhat below the high standard of the others, on account of the repetition of similar details and incidents, but even this blemish does not lessen the pleasure or worth of an engaging novel.

FRANCIS E. LOW

THE RISE OF A NEW FEDERALISM. By Jane Perry Clark. Columbia University Press. \$3.50

THE VERDICT on this book will differ widely between lawyer and layman. The former will pronounce it interesting, the latter dull. Both will discover in it valuable information. The layman will learn how ingenious are our statesmen at Washington in employing subtle legal devices to satisfy the judgment of the Supreme Court, or to avoid alarming the Solons in the home State and keep them from raising the cry of "states' rights." He will read how Florida was prevented by Congress from luring wealthy tax dodgers to live and die as citizens of Florida, by indirectly forcing upon her an inheritance tax.

The muddle of the unemployment compensation tax arising out of the Social Security Act he will find clearly explained; and he will note that the tax credit device was once more used to whip backward States into line. Though the author confines herself to the legal angle in discussing what the people are calling "the tax on payrolls," it is very evident that the tax is unfair to the workman because of the tremendous overhead it carries. In the Corporative State such compensation is provided far more equitably within the corporation with little or no overhead. The book has a severe academic flavor (delightful only to professors) and clings tenaciously to its purpose of showing how Washington and the States have cooperated to get things done in the nation.

GEORGE T. EBERLE

A DAY OF BATTLE. By Vincent Sheean. Doubleday, Doran and Co. \$2.50

THE DAY is May 11, 1745; the battle that of Fontenoy, in Flanders, between the French and English. It was not an exclusive fight. In it the brilliant Irish Brigade under Dillon and Lally made its historical charges. Technically it was a great French victory, their greatest probably in 400 years, but it also revealed the interior weakness of that nation and in particular of its focal point, Louis XV. On the theme that Fontenoy was a victory of lost causes, Mr. Sheean writes his book, arriving at the conclusion that perhaps some day men will choose their own fighting banners. The world, in its secret heart, shares the same hope. Then there might be no wars.

DANIEL M. O'CONNELL

UNDER THE HOG. By Patrick Carleton. E. P. Dutton and Co. \$2.50

THE TITLE of this exceptionally fine historical novel is derived from the jingle written by Richard Colyngbourne and nailed to the door of St. Paul's:

The Cat, the Rat and Lovell our Dog
Ruleth all England under the Hog.

The Hog was Richard III, so called because of the white, wild-boar device which was the favorite badge, embroidered on all his clothes, and with which all his armor and saddle trappings were always decorated. The author claims that no characters are fictitious, that all events took place. Certainly he has made them relive in a language so virile and through a narrative so powerful that this book occupies a place apart from ordinary fiction. The hero is a Richard III not to be recognized from the Shakespearean picture: wise, kind to the oppressed, jealous for the abolition of civil strife and, therefore, ruthless to enemies of his cause—a dynamic force in a slight, almost weakling body, but no hunchback. *Under the Hog* is well worth reading and worth saving to read again.

ROBERT E. HOLLAND

THEATRE

UP till a few years ago New York's theatrical season began on Labor Day. For a long time it was John Drew who ushered it in, usually at the Empire Theatre and with a new English comedy. Mr. Drew was a popular star with a large following of personal friends and "fans," and these came in from Long Island and other nearby resorts to lend prestige to his openings.

They suffered severely from the heat, and after the tumult and shouting of the first night had died down there was a quick return by these pilgrims to the seashore and the mountains. It took New York producers a long time to realize that September days are dog days to the theatre world, and that plays put on in the early part of that month are severely handicapped.

Producers have now learned this lesson. Whereas we used to have seven or eight plays offered us during September we now have only two or three, and they come on late in the month. Even Guthrie McClintic, a very brave man, has delayed his New York opening of *Legend*, the Jesse James drama, till September 19. If he really puts it on as early as that, it will hold the New York stage in lonely state as the first important entry of the new season.

It should be an interesting one as well, for the life of Jesse James is a part of our western history, and Dean Jagger, who is chosen for the leading rôle, is pretty sure to play it with inspiration. So are Dorothy Gish and Mildred Natwick, in the leading feminine rôles. However, the play is in rehearsal now, and all sorts of changes may take place. It is scheduled to open at the Empire, that historic home of September theatrical births.

Philadelphia will have an August 29 production of Max Gordon's new Kaufman-Hart revue, *Sing Out the News*. This should strike New York by the end of September, but no definite opening date has yet been announced. Another possible late September attraction is Stanley Young's *Bright Rebel*, the Lord Byron play which has just been having a week's tryout in Guilford, Connecticut. The Mercury Theatre definitely announces its revival of *Too Much Johnson*, and its production of George Beuchner's *Danton's Death*, as due here before October first. Kirby Grant also optimistically predicts a New York opening of *Thirty Days Hath September* on September 30.

More than usual interest is felt in the coming of *Charles and Mary*, by Joan Temple, in which the tragic rôle of Mary Lamb was played in London by the author. This has been undergoing considerable combing and brushing in our provinces during the tryout season, and should be ready for New York early in October. Brenda Dahlen will act the rôle of Mary in the American production, and Myron McCormick will give us his interpretation of the weary and wistful Charles Lamb. He may do it admirably, but one wonders why Roland Young was not persuaded to take the part.

Special interest is also felt in the production of the Maxwell Anderson-Kurt Weill musical offering, *Knickerbocker Holiday*, which is coming to us very early in October with Walter Huston in the leading rôle. As the leading rôle is that of Peter Stuyvesant, the offering will naturally be saturated with early Dutch influence and atmosphere. The libretto is pronounced a hit, and Kurt Weill's music is said to be enchanting. Boston is having the offering this month and is trying to decide exactly what it thinks about it.

From time to time I have made a few remarks in this column about little Peter Holden, the child star in *On Borrowed Time*. Peter recently had a vacation. Work agrees with him, but apparently vacations do not. Peter, who bloomed at work all season, fell ill on vacation and must take another holiday.

ELIZABETH JORDAN

FILMS

BOY MEETS GIRL. The satire on motion pictures and their associated eccentrics, which is given free rein in this rowdy comedy, helps it to bridge some absurdities of its own and emerge a vigorously amusing film without much appeal to the intellect. It was adapted from a brash stage play and director Lloyd Bacon has preserved as much of that spirit as could be translated to the screen. A ready index to the quality of its wit is found in the fact that much of it stems from the hare-brained heroine's sponsored motherhood. Two Hollywood authors meet an expectant mother working as a cafeteria waitress and in a moment of inspiration offer to put the baby in pictures by advertising methods. The feat is successfully maneuvered, but along with fame comes a scramble for legal control of the new star, which pits the authors against a mercenary cowboy actor. The story depends for its pace on that technique which alternates triumphs and near disasters. Plausibility is never strained after and sometimes the plot goes over the deep end of ludicrousness. Marie Wilson manages one of the satirical characterizations, that of the not so bright waitress, with absolute naturalness and Pat O'Brien supplies another acid portrait as the publicity-mad scenarist. Ralph Bellamy and J. Cagney are also involved. The production is entertaining but on rather a low level, and so it is best reserved for adults. (Warner)

FOUR DAUGHTERS. This is the portrait of an attractive family group, posed with more than a suggestion of sentiment and well-shaded to show off domestic joy and tribulation in an appealing combination. Only occasionally does the film slip into the heavy pathos for which author Fanny Hurst has such a fondness. For the most part, it is refreshing experience to follow the destinies of Adam Lemp and his four daughters. The girls become interesting as romance enters their lives, by invitation or otherwise, and chief emphasis falls on the unhappy courtship of daughter Ann by a despairing musician. Michael Curtiz changes his moods frequently, keeping them attuned to the progress of the daughter of the moment, and easily fuses the separate lines of development into a coherent and compelling story. Claude Rains and May Robson are excellent in homely rôles and the younger members of the cast, including John Garfield and Priscilla Lane, follow suit. This is a maturely interesting picture with a strong pull on the emotions. (Warner)

BLOCKHEADS. Laurel and Hardy have fallen upon hard times in this feeble and repetitious comedy. The material involved would probably have sufficed for a short film, but to make a feature out of an anecdote is carrying the joke too far. They go through a familiar bag of tricks, to make matters worse, and the affair has the air of being assembled from the cutting-room floor. The two pals are reunited after twenty years when Laurel discovers that the war is over and he can leave his sentry post in France. Visiting Hardy, he is embroiled in a domestic war calculated to make up for his twenty-year isolation. The domineering wife, the jealous husband across the hall, in short, all the stock figures of slapstick comedy parade through this tenuous farce. It is family fun, as far as it goes. (MGM)

THE MISSING GUEST. Mystery in a haunted house forms the slight foundation for this lunatic thriller. The harrowing technique is reduced to an absurdity, since the film succeeds neither as comedy nor mystery but jumbles both in such weird proportions that the fun becomes mysterious and the mystery hilarious. Paul Kelly is wasted in this second feature for family programs. (Universal)

THOMAS J. FITZMORRIS

EVENTS

CONSIDERABLE unrest was reported during the week, much of it caused by temperamental fauna. . . . A bicyclist in England noticed the sedan in front of him was acting curiously. It zigzagged wildly, finally plunged off the road into a fence. The woman driver, her face bespeaking profound terror, leaped from the car, begged the cyclist for succor. There was a mouse in the car. . . . Dog-racing promoters suffered heavy financial losses in London when an unprecedented epidemic of hysteria swept through greyhound kennels. . . . A Wisconsin bee flew into a moving automobile, commenced biting the back of the driver's neck. While the driver was seeking to disentangle the bee from the upper part of his torso, the auto headed into a neighboring forest where it failed to knock down the first large tree it contacted. . . . A feud between rural letter carriers and bluebirds caused concern to bird lovers. A growing sport among the bluebirds is that of taking letters from rural mail boxes and scattering the correspondence around the countryside. The letter carriers are opposed to the sport, maintaining it is an invasion of their function. . . . Sad incidents were reported. . . . In the Middle West a four-year-old boy was found to be suffering with acute alcoholism. . . . In California, a husband who was doing his own cooking while his wife was away, attempted to boil a can of tamales. The can exploded. . . . While a five-year-old Canadian boy was on his way to buy ice cream, a thief stole his nickel. . . . On the other hand, encouraging reports were not wanting. . . . A survey showed that an increasing number of butchers no longer weigh their thumbs with the meat. . . . The number of firemen who park their private autos next to fire plugs appeared to be decreasing. Only one fireman was fined during the week for indulging in the habit. . . . Fewer policemen were held up and robbed, only two instances being reported. The need for bodyguards for policemen no longer seems to be great. . . .

Infelicities in the matrimonial state continued to be observed. . . . An eighty-seven-year-old husband sought a divorce from his eighty-five-year-old wife. The judge inquired: "How long have you been quarreling?" "Sixty-four years," the husband replied. "How long have you been married?" "Sixty-four years," said the husband. . . . One of the longest spats on record was observed in the Middle West. Fifty years ago, two lovers spat. Last week, they made up and were married. . . . A growing tendency toward foresight was glimpsed. A Wisconsin man paid for his parking tickets in advance. . . . The lack of observation inherent in some people was demonstrated. In Oklahoma, a man failed to notice that the thing he was parking his car on was a steep hill. When he returned his car was gone. It had rolled into a lake. . . . A drive against police sassers was inaugurated in the Southwest. Two sassers were fined. . . . Stricter enforcement of the traffic laws was begun. In New York, a man was fined for driving a car with bad brakes, bad windshield, no tags, no permit. The man sold the car for twenty-five dollars, paid the fine. . . . New methods of collecting debts were tried. In New Jersey a grocer posted on his front window the names and addresses of people owing him money. . . . Science continued going ahead. Research showed that swishing noises do not accompany the aurora borealis, a belief formerly held.

The lack of proportion between cause and effect which frequently occurs was demonstrated in New York. A broom caused an outpouring of police in cars and on foot. The broom, shaken by a passing elevated train, fell, set off the burglar alarm. . . . The legality of a time-honored custom was finally established. Wives may take money from their husbands' trousers according to a Western court's decision.

THE PARADER